DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 345 918 RC 018 695

TITLE	Hearing on the Challenges Facing Urban and Rural Schools before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. House of Representatives, One Hundred Second Congress, First Session (November 14, 1991).
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, DC. House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-16-037514-2
PUB DATE	92
NOTE	100p.; Serial No. 102-85. Some pages contain small print.
AVAILABLE FROM	U.S. Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Change; *Educational Legislation; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Aid; *Federal Legislation; Hearings; Inner City; Poverty; Rural Development; *Rural Education; School Community Relationship; *Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 102nd; *National Education Goals 1990

ABSTRACT

Testimony given at a congressional hearing on the unique problems of urban and rural schools, the federal role in addressing these problems, and the availability of resources at state and local levels is presented in this report. Representative William Jefferson described the disadvantages of urban schools, compared to suburban schools, with respect to reaching the six national education goals for the year 2000. He spoke in support of the proposed Urban Schools of America Act (USA), which would fund urban school improvement at the local level, renovation of facilities, research and evaluation activities, technical assistance, and staff development. Lois Adams-Rogers, from the Kentucky Department of Education, discussed rural poverty in Kentucky, rural cultural influences on education, the special needs of rural education, the Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990, and the need for federal aid. Dale Lestina represented Organizations Concerned about Rural Education (OCRE), whose goals are reforming rural school curriculum, developing rural schools as community centers, and promoting the role of rural schools in community economic revitalization. OCRE supported the proposed Rural Schools of America Act of 1991, which would fund early childhood programs, parent involvement activities, school-community linkages, capital improvement, and educational innovation. Superintendents from Tucson (Arizona) and Portland (Oregon) outlined the poor status of urban schools on the national education goals. Also included are charts of the share of statewide expenditures and poverty enrollment for 47 cities and estimated USA grants to eligible cities. (SV)

ED345918

HEARING ON THE CHALLENGES FACING URBAN AND RURAL SCHOOLS

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SECOND CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, NOVEMBER 14, 1991

Serial No. 102–85

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

RC018695

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
[X] This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
[ ] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
50-273 WASHINGTON : 1992

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-037514-2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan, *Chairman*

JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
NITA M. LOWEY, New York
JOLENE UNSOELD, Washington
CRAIG A. WASHINGTON, Texas
JOSÉ E. SERRANO, New York
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
ROBERT E. ANDREWS, New Jersey
WILLIAM J. JEFFERSON, Louisiana
JOHN F. REED, Rhode Island
TIM ROEMER, Indiana
JOHN W. OLVER, Massachusetts
ED PASTOR, Arizona
RON DE LUGO, Virgin Islands
JAIME B. FUSTER, Puerto Rico

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina
SUSAN MOLINARI, New York
BILL BARRETT, Nebraska
JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio
SCOTT L. KLUG, Wisconsin
MICKEY EDWARDS, Oklahoma
RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM, California

PATRICIA F. RISSLER, *Staff Director*
JAY EAGEN, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan, *Chairman*

GEORGE MILLER, California
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
NITA M. LOWEY, New York
JOLENE UNSOELD, Washington
WILLIAM J. JEFFERSON, Louisiana
JOHN F. REED, Rhode Island
TIM ROEMER, Indiana
CRAIG A. WASHINGTON, Texas
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
JOHN W. OLVER, Massachusetts
ED PASTORE, Arizona
JAIME B. FUSTER, Puerto Rico

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
SCOTT L. KLUG, Wisconsin
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan
SUSAN MOLINARI, New York
JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio
RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM, California

CONTENTS

Page

Hearing held in Washington, DC, November 14, 1991 1

Statement of:

Adams-Rodgers, Lois, Deputy Commissioner and Chief of Staff, Kentucky Department of Education, Frankfort, KY; Dale Lestina, President, Organizations Concerned About Rural Education, Washington, DC; Matthew Prophet, Superintendent, Portland Public School, Portland, OR; and, George Garcia, Superintendent, Tucson, AZ 18

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera:

Adams-Rodgers, Lois, Deputy Commissioner and Chief of Staff, Kentucky Department of Education, Frankfort, KY, prepared statement of 21

Garcia, George, Superintendent, Tucson, AZ, prepared statement of 49

Jefferson, Hon. William J., a Representative in Congress from the State of Louisiana, prepared statement of 4

Lestina, Dale, President, Organizations Concerned About Rural Education, Washington, DC, prepared statement of 34

Prophet, Matthew, Superintendent, Portland Public School, Portland, OR, prepared statement of 49

HEARING ON THE CHALLENGES FACING URBAN AND RURAL SCHOOLS

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1991

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY,
SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 9 a.m., Room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Dale E. Kildee [Chairman] presiding.

Members present: Representatives Kildee, Perkins, Jefferson, Goodling, Mink, Olver, Molinari, Reed, Owens, Pastor, Gunderson, and Petri.

Staff present: Susan Wilhelm, staff director; Lynn Selmser, professional staff member; Margaret Kajeckas, legislative associate; Damian J. Thorman, legislative associate; June Harris, legislative specialist; and Omer Waddles, staff director, Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities.

Chairman KILDEE. The Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education convenes this morning for the second in a series of hearings examining what additional steps the Federal Government can take to improve education throughout our Nation.

As members are aware, the full committee has previously approved H.R. 3320 to promote coordinated changes in education, to benefit all children.

This morning's hearing will focus on the unique challenges facing urban and rural schools. Low student achievement, illiteracy, a high dropout rate, and teen pregnancy are just some of the problems common to both urban and rural schools.

Witnesses will address the adequacy of the Federal contribution in addressing these and other distinctive urban and rural challenges, and the availability of resources at the State and local level.

Before proceeding with the testimony this morning, I would like to recognize my good friend, and the ranking Republican member of both the subcommittee and the full committee, the Congressman from Pennsylvania, Bill Goodling.

Mr. GOODLING. I would only say, Mr. Chairman, since the Pork brothers are represented here, and they represent greater city schools, I have to fight for the poor rural schools out in my district. Our efforts, of course, will always be to have the perfect balance between those two.

Chairman KILDEE. I am going to do two things first this morning. I am going to call upon our colleague, Mr. AuCoin, to introduce a witness. And before she testifies, however, we will go to our video tape, I think it is 8 minutes, that Mr. Jefferson has provided.

Mr. AuCoin, you are well respected in the entire Congress and respected before this committee, and we welcome you here this morning.

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much, I appreciate this opportunity. To you and to the members of the committee, I want to commend you for addressing the unique needs of both urban and rural schools in our country today. Clearly, the challenges facing education in this country demand drastic attention, and the support of Federal leaders on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue.

I believe it is time that the Federal Government stand and deliver on its commitment to good quality education. I am delighted, Mr. Chairman, to be at this table with a panel of distinguished educators.

My purpose today is to introduce—without too much embarrassment to him—Matt Prophet, the Superintendent of Portland, Oregon Public Schools, to this distinguished committee.

Mr. Chairman, while Matt has spent the early part of his educational career in your home State of Michigan, we in Oregon now lay claim to him as an Oregon pioneer. In his nearly 10 years of service in Portland, he has set a standard of excellence. He is truly a shining star among educational leaders in this country.

What impresses me is that he offers a unique perspective on the particular needs of urban education systems. Under his leadership, Portland students have made incredibly great strides.

For example, Portland's dropout rate is among the lowest in America for urban schools. Not because we don't have at-risk kids, but because Portland offers innovative programs for teen parents, kids who can't succeed in a traditional setting, and strong vocational programs.

Still more needs to be done. I think the members of this committee know that. Certainly Matt Prophet knows that, the leaders across the country know that. And that is the business you are about today. I will let you get on with your work, and turn the program, Mr. Chairman, back to you and to your committee.

It would be a more normal arrangement for me to introduce Prophet and let him begin to speak, but I understand your format today. I'm just very proud to be here, and I really do commend your committee for focusing on both the urban aspect as well as the rural aspect of our pressing educational problems today.

And I am delighted to be able to bring to you truly an Oregon pioneer, with roots in Michigan. Thank you very much.

Chairman KILDEE. One of the reasons that we lost him to Oregon is the statement that a Prophet is not recognized in his own State. [Laughter.]

Chairman KILDEE. Mr. Jefferson, do you have any introduction to your television presentation this morning?

Mr. JEFFERSON. Yes, sir. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hope that all of the technical provisions have been made, are in place, and that this show is ready to get on the road. I see them still fiddling

around with it, Mr. Chairman, so I don't have any real confidence that they are ready.

Well, let me say this. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for calling this important oversight hearing on the challenges facing urban and rural school districts around our country.

A year ago, as you know, President Bush and the Nation's governors agreed upon six national goals would help American remain competitive in the next century. These goals, as we have pored over them over these hearings, over the hearing we have just recently had and other meetings of this committee, are school readiness for all children, competency in co-subjects, 90 percent graduation rate, world class math and science achievement, literacy for all adults, and drug-free schools.

Now these are lofty goals, Mr. Chairman, and the President set out a strategy for reaching these goals, called America 2000. But upon inspection, the President's plan is revealed to be long on fluff and rhetoric, and short on substance.

Setting the goals was a starting point. The President's education plan nowhere addresses the very critical and particular needs of urban communities where 12 percent of all U.S. school children and over 50 percent of all minority children are being educated.

Chairman KILDEE. Why does the Pentagon's equipment always work and ours doesn't?

[Laughter.]

Mr. JEFFERSON. What I would like to do, Mr. Chairman, before we risk any more technical difficulties, is to have the little 10 minute, or 6 or 7 minute now since it has been edited, video show here; a presentation that is being made around the country to solicit support and to explain the USA Bill, The Urban Schools of America Act.

And it is a cryptic way, a graphic way of explaining what the act is about and what the need is for it, and what we expect to achieve once it is enacted into law.

So, if they are ready to go with it we will permit that to happen now, and then I will come back, Mr. Chairman, with your leave, and make a few more comments before we proceed. Thank you, sir.

[The prepared statement of Hon. William J. Jefferson follows:]

Statement of William J. Jefferson

Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary Education

November 14, 1991

I want to thank you Chairman Kildee for calling this important oversight hearing on the challenges facing urban and rural schools.

A year ago, President Bush and the nation's governors agreed upon six national goals that would help America remain competitive in the next century. These goals are school readiness for all children, competency in core subjects, a 90% graduation rate, world class math and science achievement, literacy for all adults, and drug free schools. The President set out a strategy for reaching these goals called America 2000, but upon inspection the President's plan was revealed to be long on fluff and rhetoric and short on

substance.

Setting the goals was a starting point, but the President's education plan in no way addresses the very critical and particular needs of urban communities where 12 percent of all U.S. school children and over 50 percent of all minority children are being educated. Urban schools are at a great disadvantage compared to their suburban counterparts with respect to reaching the education goals. Today urban preschool children have half the access to early childhood development programs as suburban school children. The dropout rate in urban schools is 67% higher than that in suburban or rural schools. Declining numbers of urban minority youth are pursing postsecondary education. Teacher shortages in urban schools are 2.5 times greater than in other schools systems. Urban school students continue to score lowest on math and science achievement tests. And every

day in inner city schools a student brings drugs or weapons into the classroom. Urban schools enroll a disporportionately large number of at risk youth and these schools need extra help if they are to meet the national goals by the year 2000 or ever.

Because of the widespread dissatisfaction over the failure of the President's proposal to create a mechanism for real reform for all children, this committee introduced H.R. 3320, the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act. The goal of H.R. 3320 is to effect system wide reform through efforts initiated at the local level. The Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act reaches significantly farther than America 2000, but even its supporters acknowledge that it is only a partial response to the President's proposal, and that much more must be done to ensure that the education of every child is improved regardless of whether that child attends school in

a rural area, the suburbs or an inner city. Reform in general is meaningless if the students suffering the most severe deficits continue to exhibit poor school preparedness, experience poor nutrition, and endure high dropout rates and if the majority of schools excel while others lack proper instructional materials. These extraordinarily weak links will ultimately insure the lack of success of our nation in achieving our stated educational goals.

The Urban Schools of America Act, H.R. 1669 is one of the additional crucial steps that must be taken to make our reform efforts truly comprehensive in nature.

The Urban Schools of America Act authorizes 3.1 billion dollars to fund a wide range of flexible local school improvement plans calculated to reach the national goals.

Title I of the USA bill authorizes 1.5 billion for urban school improvement. Five percent of the funds are reserved for competitive grants for schools showing unusually high progress toward meeting the national goals. The remaining funds will be distributed by the Secretary according to enrollment. Five percent will be reserved for grants to community-based organizations or nonprofit partnerships between eligible LEAs and city-wide collaboratives of private sector business or universities. Not more than five percent of any grant may be used for administrative costs.

Any eligible local educational agency desiring to receive a grant from the secretary submits an application to the State educational agency and to the Secretary for approval. The LEA may with the approval of the Secretary use the first six months of the initial program year and not more than 15 percent of the first years allotment for planning purposes. The

application may be for a period of not more than three years. If after three years an eligible LEA is able to demonstrate that it has increased the achievement level of the students in the lowest quartiles in the schools assisted then the LEA may continue the project with the funds under this act.

The LEA shall develop and prepare its application with a local advisory group comprised of representatives from such groups as local government agencies, community-based organizations, service providers, teachers, parents, colleges and universities, businesses, principals, school administrators, counselors, students, state educational agencies, state boards of education, and organizations with an interest and expertise in improving urban education. This board shall be appointed by the superintendent of schools and the president of the board of education of the LEA.

Each application shall include a ranking of all schools in the LEA by achievement, poverty and racial isolation, a description of the community served by the LEA, a description of the LEA's collaboration with the local advisory group, the goals selected by the LEA and a rationale for selecting these goals or others, how the funds will be used to meet the national education goals, a description how successful models will be replicated, the criteria the LEA will use to measure progress and what the LEA has done to ensure that its assessment tools do not have a negative effect on racial or language minorities.

Funds under this act may be used to (1) increase the academic achievement of urban school children to at least the national average (2) ensure the readiness of all urban children (3) increase the graduation rates of urban students to at least the national average (4) prepare urban school graduates to

enter higher education, pursue careers and exercise their responsibilities as citizens (5) recruit and retain qualified teachers (6) decrease the use of drugs and alcohol among urban students and to enhance the physical and emotional health of such students.

Under the USA bill the Secretary would also be required to prepare a report on the impact of Federal regulations, guidelines and policies on urban public schools and make recommendations on how to simplify regulations, guidelines and policies so that more resources can be devoted to improving urban public schools.

Title II of the Urban Schools of America act authorizes 1.5 billion dollars for school building repair and renovation. Over 75 percent of urban school buildings are over 25 years old, 33 percent of these buildings are over 50 years old.

These buildings are often in serious disrepair and create poor and demoralizing working and learning conditions.

Any eligible local educational agency desiring to receive an allotment under this title shall submit an application to the Secretary. The application shall include an assessment of needs for building repair, renovation and construction, description of the activities planned at each site and an assurance of proper usage of Federal funds.

Authorized uses of funds under title II include but are not limited to the installation or upgrading of school security and communications systems, construction of new facilities when old facilities are more cost efficiently torn down rather than renovated; alterations to buildings to meet special program, curricula, site-based management needs, or the needs of special populations; facilities costs associated with

lengthening the school day or school year; energy conservation; removal of environmentally hazardous material, such as lead, radon and asbestos and alterations to buildings to enable such building to serve as one-stop family support centers.

Title III authorizes 100 million dollars for research on urban schools. A National Institute for Urban Education is created and 20 percent of the funds under this title are reserved for its use. The institute assists eligible local educational agencies in developing research and evaluation activities to assess progress toward meeting the national education goals; conduct research that will assist urban schools in enhancing learning, teaching and system management; design in consultation with eligible LEAs a comprehensive evaluation strategy for assessing progress under this Act; and serve as a clearinghouse on urban

education.

The remainder of the funds under this act will be allotted on a per capita basis. The authorized uses of the funds under this title include but are not limited to collaborative and coordinated research and evaluation of educational techniques or approaches used in multiple LEAs; evaluation of projects funded under Title I of this act; technical assistance to individual schools and teachers involved in projects funded under Title I of this act; staff training in schools assisted under this act; provision of information to parents on test results and interpretation; research on school policies and practices which may be barriers to success of students in school. Title III also amends the Department of Education Organization Act to create within the Department of Education an Assistant Secretary of Urban Education.

Title IV establishes an Interagency Council on Urban Schools to coordinate federal programs for urban schools across various departments and agencies. Under this title the President is authorized to call a White House Conference of Urban Education. A national commission on urban education is created to study various issues affecting urban schools including demographic changes in student enrollment, special needs populations in urban schools, unserved and underserved students, student performance, financial support for urban schools, and teacher shortages. Importantly, Title IV specifies that the funds authorized under the USA bill are to supplement and not supplant non Federal funds.

Urban schools are overwhelmed with nonacademic problems and increasingly they are finding it necessary to devote more resources to a variety of efforts beyond the standard curriculum and school expenditures. These problems

are putting a severe strain on budgets that are not expanding as fast as the urban schools' responsibilities. Sadly, state and federal funding of inner city schools do not reflect the importance or the magnitude of the task urban schools are asked to perform. If a comprehensive educational reform effort is to suceed we must have the means to help ailing inner city schools succeed -- what we need is the commitment to force change -- commitment from this Congress, the President and the nation.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. Jefferson. We will proceed now with the presentation.

[Videotape presentation.]

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. Jefferson, for bringing that film to us.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And could I have leave for one brief moment?

There are a lot of important guests here today, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to extend a special welcome to a number of very important ones, who have come from the local area.

Chairman KILDEE. Certainly.

Mr. JEFFERSON. They came specifically to support the USA Bill and to learn about Congress. They are from the Eastern Senior High School in Washington, DC, and the School Without Walls in Washington, DC. Mr. Chairman, they are here in this audience and we really would like to welcome them here, and hope they will learn a lot and get closer to their government, and can go back and encourage others who are in school with them to get involved as well.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I hope you will permit me later on to come back and try and sum up issues here.

Chairman KILDEE. Certainly, and I especially welcome the students. I tell people in real life I was a school teacher. I taught high school in Flint, Michigan. I taught Latin. Tried to grab an American History class when I could too. But we especially welcome the students here this morning. This is what education is all about, and we appreciate your concern for the improvement of education in this country. Thank you very much.

Our witnesses this morning include: Lois Adams-Rodgers, Deputy Commissioner and Chief of Staff, the Kentucky Department of Education, Frankfort, Kentucky, she's from the great State of Kentucky, as is Chris Perkins; Dale Lestina, who is well known to this committee, who wears many hats, has many interests, and an abiding and deep love for education, President of the Organizations Concerned About Rural Education, Washington, DC; Matthew Prophet, Superintendent of the Portland Public School, Portland, Oregon, who formerly was in Lansing, Michigan. We regret losing you there. You left a great reputation there, and you carried that reputation with you to Oregon. You did a great job there, and I regret at times that we lose some of those great educational leaders in our State to other States, but we know you are doing an excellent job out there; and George Garcia, Superintendent, Tucson Public Schools, Tucson, Arizona.

Ms. Rodgers, you may begin.

STATEMENT OF LOIS ADAMS-RODGERS, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER AND CHIEF OF STAFF, KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, FRANKFORT, KENTUCKY; DALE LESTINA, PRESIDENT, ORGANIZATIONS CONCERNED ABOUT RURAL EDUCATION, WASHINGTON, DC; MATTHEW PROPHET, SUPERINTENDENT, PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOL, PORTLAND, OREGON; AND, GEORGE GARCIA, SUPERINTENDENT, TUCSON, ARIZONA

Ms. ADAMS-RODGERS. Thank you. Thank you, Chairman Kildee. We appreciate the opportunity to be here today. It is always good to address the issue of education, and certainly fitting to be in the Carl D. Perkins room as we address this issue. And it is good to see Congressman Perkins also.

On behalf of the Commonwealth of Kentucky and the Department of Education, I want to tell you that we think the importance of your committee addressing the needs of children living in rural areas is extremely important, because Kentucky is basically a rural State.

I am also pleased to have this opportunity to support your efforts in the Rural Schools of America Act of 1991. I have a special feeling for rural children because I have spent much of my educational career teaching and serving as an administrator in a rural agricultural Kentucky school district, where the population of the largest town is a few hundred people.

This has given me the unique opportunity to observe and work directly with, and understand the children and families in rural areas.

As State Director of Special Education Programs, and now as Deputy Commissioner of the Department of Education in Kentucky, I have had the opportunity to work with every one of our 176 school districts in the State, and all of those, of course, representing rural areas.

From my experience, I know firsthand that rural children and rural schools do have unique needs. And to provide them with equal educational opportunities, they need special attention from all levels of government.

We are acutely aware of the needs of rural children in Kentucky because of our rural nature. According to the 1990 census, 48 percent of our people live in rural areas. More than a third of our counties have no urban population at all. And we have no reason to believe that that will change significantly over the next couple of decades.

Kentucky is also a relatively poor State, and the poverty happens to be concentrated in rural areas. In recent years, more than a fourth of our local school districts, most of them in rural areas, have been reporting more than one-half of their students receiving free or reduced priced lunches.

The economic conditions are worsening in some rural areas as well. In fact, last month in the Harlan County area, one of our most rural Appalachian counties, in 1 week more than 2,000 people had applied for just 150 jobs at the new Wal-Mart Store which was developing there.

While statistics tell us where our poverty is and the extent of it, they do not reflect the complexity of rural poverty. It is deeply

rooted, and it is cultural. People in rural poverty tend to be isolated economically, culturally, and educationally from middle class mainstream and the diversity of experiences and opportunities it offers to children.

While rural children require something extra to break the cycle of intergenerational poverty, our rural districts have historically had the fewest resources. Historically, per pupil spending in Kentucky's urban areas has been significantly higher, as much as double that of rural districts, and our wealthiest urban district has nine times the taxable resources of our poorest rural district.

While rural school districts have fewer resources, they have extraordinary service delivery problems and costs. People transportation is, of course, the obvious one. Our rural districts spend two to three times as much per pupil just in getting students to and from school.

But we also have special problems in providing services for handicapped children as well, offering a broad curriculum involving parents, finding specialized teachers and staff, and having access to health and social services for children.

I am very pleased and proud that Kentucky during the last session of our General Assembly has responded aggressively to the needs of children, and particularly those living in the rural areas. I believe our Reform Act of 1990 could serve as a national model, and I would like to describe for you briefly some of the principal features as they relate to rural children.

We are moving aggressively to close the funding gap between urban and rural schools. By 1996, it will be substantially eliminated. As a result, rural children will benefit from the same resources that have been available in urban districts.

Secondly, our new finance formula recognizes that it costs more to provide equal educational opportunities to students from low income families. The formula features a percentage add-on per pupil for all children qualifying for free lunch, as an at-risk factor. That is a significant benefit to the rural schools.

Our Reform Act also provided what created a safety net that is composed of four KERA strands, Kentucky Education Reform Act strands, all of which will significantly benefit children from rural areas.

First of all, we have a State funded preschool program for our 4-year-olds qualifying for free lunch. That program is significant in that 18,000 4-year-olds are being served this year, and that will make a tremendous difference in the educational programs for those students as they go through the elementary and secondary programs.

Secondly, we have a statewide tutorial program for students needing extended school service, or extra instructional time.

Third, we have begun a network of family resource and youth service centers in schools with concentrations of children from low income families, to ensure that children are receiving needed social and health services, with an excellent interagency model for that cooperation and coordination of services.

And finally, we will move next year to an ungraded primary school concept as a way of nurturing children towards success at their own pace through a developmentally appropriate program.

Beyond this safety net we have in place a 6-year, $200 million program that will bring state-of-the-art computer and television technology into every school and every classroom in Kentucky. This program will be particularly helpful in providing a broad range of courses to students, and instructional materials to teachers in rural areas.

We are changing the focus of our curriculum instruction and assessment to the ability of students to demonstrate performance. The emphasis will shift from knowing to doing, from memorization to the application of skills, from the abstract to the concrete. And we believe this style of learning will be more effective for all students, and particularly those from the rural areas.

Finally, through score based decision making and State deregulation, we are giving teachers, parents, and administrators at each school the opportunity to design their programs to meet the unique needs of their students and to produce the valued outcome set by the Council for School Performance Standards.

While we think Kentucky's approach to reform will assist you in your decision making, we also have some suggestions for how the Federal Government can help us. First of all, you can help us through continued support of research, particularly the kind of research and service provided through the regional educational laboratories.

Secondly is technology. All States will need assistance in designing systems that are cost effective to use computers, satellites, fiber optics, and other technology to bring the best instructional programs and professional development opportunities into all schools, and particularly those in the rural areas.

Third is support for improved teaching. National Teacher Corps or National Teacher Exchange Program could certainly help rural districts meet staff shortages and provide the needed diversity of experience into those rural areas.

And fourth is regulatory flexibility. To work best, our school-based decision makers need to have the same flexibility with Federal programs that they will have with State and local programs, to provide an excellent program for all children.

And fifth is the overall support for education. While Kentucky is addressing its intrastate equity problems, we suffer as a whole State because of intrastate funding inequities. Education is indeed everybody's business, and we very strongly believe that. And, necessarily, it takes funding to provide those opportunities to all of the States.

In conclusion, we are proud of our efforts in Kentucky to reshape our schools, to address systemic reform, and to address the needs of children in rural areas. But we need and welcome your assistance. The Rural Schools of America Act of 1991 will provide us much needed assistance in an area of critical need.

Thank you very much for your attention to the needs of children, and for the opportunity to be here today.

[The prepared statement of Lois Adams-Rodgers follows:]

The Educational Needs of Kentucky's Rural Children

By Lois Adams-Rodgers
Deputy Commissioner and Chief of Staff
Kentucky Department of Education
November 14, 1991

Introduction

On behalf of the Kentucky Department of Education and the Commonwealth of Kentucky, let me express my sincere appreciation for two things. First is the time and attention this committee is devoting to the needs of children in rural America through this hearing on the Rural Schools of America Act of 1991. Second is the opportunity you have afforded me to share with you the action we have already taken in Kentucky to address their needs and to suggest some ways that the federal government may want to use the Kentucky Education Reform Act as a model for the nation.

The fundamental principle underlying the position taken in this paper is that rural children, have unique needs, and, in order to provide them with equal educational opportunities, they need special attention from all levels of government. The Rural Schools of America Act of 1991 identifies those needs and outlines and effective approach to meeting them.

Kentucky's Persistent Rural Character

While much of the nation has become predominantly urban or metropolitan in recent decades, Kentucky persists in being a rural state. In the decade of the eighties, the proportion of Kentucky's population classified as urban grew only slightly to 52 percent from 51 percent. While Kentucky had a net outmigration of 100,000 people during the decade, its rural population declined by only 25,000. More than a third of our counties had no urban population in 1990, and many of the areas of our state which are classified as urban by the Census Bureau retain a distinctive rural character.

Like the adult population, our school population was approximately half rural in 1980, and it remains approximately half rural in 1990. There is nothing to suggest that our population will change rapidly from rural to urban in the upcoming decades. It is clear that the problems associated with educating rural children in Kentucky will not vanish through urbanization or other demographic changes.

Kentucky is also a poor state. According to the 1990 Statistical Abstract of the United States, in 1988 Kentucky ranked fourth highest nationally in the percentage of food stamp recipients, 10th in the precentage of public

aid recipients and 12th in the percentage of Social Security recipients. Our unemployment rate that year ranked fifth. We were 42nd in disposable income per capita and 47th in the ratio of employed persons to total population. During the last half of the decade, the per acre value of our farmland declined by 10 percent.

Furthermore, the overall state statistics mask the concentration and pervasiveness of poverty in our rural areas. According to the 1980 U.S. Census, in 13 of our 120 counties -- all of them rural -- more than 40 percent of the children under 18 years of age were in poverty. In 37 counties -- all rural -- more than 30 percent of the children were living in poverty. And in 100 counties, most of them predominantly rural, more than 15 percent of the children were reported to be in poverty.

While the 1990 Census data on family income is not yet available, we have no reason to believe that the picture has changed substantially during the past decade. In recent years, more than a fourth of our school districts -- most of them in rural areas -- have been reporting that more than half of their students are receiving free or reduced-price lunches. In a handful of districts, the participation rate regularly exceeds 80 percent.

The economic desperation in rural Kentucky was illustrated vividly last month in Harlan County. Located deep in Appalachia, Harlan is decidedly rural. While it has 36,000 people, its largest town has a population of less than 3,000. Sometimes in recent years, Harlan County has been a thriving coal mining center but not now. The demand for its coal is waning, and the remaining mines are automating rapidly. So last month in one week in Harlan County more than 2,000 people applied for 150 jobs at a new Wal-Mart store.

In a 1988 report, "Kentucky: The State and Its Educational System," Harold L. Hodgkinson of the Institute for Educational Leadership in Washington, D.C., concluded:

> "There is one condition which dominates the thought of anyone who looks at Kentucky -- rural poverty. Behind the low ratings on adult educational attainment, low high school graduation rates, and difficulty in finding skilled workers, one finds this as a root problem in the state."

Hodgkinson's use of the term "root problem" suggests that rural poverty is both fundamental to both economic and educational progress in Kentucky and that it is deeply imbedded.

The Cultural Dimension

Rural poverty is much more complex than can be suggested by simple income and educational statistics. It is cultural in nature. Hodgkinson calls it "one of the

least understood and most intransigent problems around." While our understanding of the problem may be incomplete, we do understand some aspects of it. Perhaps the most intractable aspect is cultural and economic isolation.

The social and economic environment for the last several decades in most of rural Kentucky -- particularly in Appalachia -- has been one of population losses and vanishing economic opportunities. Few people move into these rural areas from other states or even other parts of Kentucky. While some rural areas have been able to attract manufacturing plants to replace jobs on the farm, Appalachian communities have had little success in replacing mining jobs. Fundamentally, the rugged terrain and lack of proximity to major national transportation routes make the area unsuitable for modern manufacturing and distribution businesses.

Generally, those who leave rural areas in search of economic opportunities are those who have the most education. And they tend to be younger than the population as a whole. That leaves behind a disproportionate number of older, less educated and increasingly poor people. Seldom is there an infusion of people in these communities with different backgrounds or experiences.

The result is that -- even in the age of television -- we have children growing up in an increasingly isolated, increasingly insulated cultural environment. Their parents are likely to be high school dropouts. Their grandparents may be functionally illiterate. At some point in their lives -- sometimes for extended periods -- their families have been unemployed or on welfare. Relatives, neighbors, and friends share similar experiences. Their teachers and principals frequently are products of the local school system; they attended a regional state university and came home to work immediately after graduation. For young people in these areas, there is a limited range of types of jobs available. The few available jobs tend to be service jobs requiring a limited range of skills. The diversity of experiences and the opportunities for diversity that are important to educating children are generally lacking in rural communities.

In addition, family relationships are very important in rural areas. Parents value children, and they value having their adult children living in close proximity. That desire often mitigates against education. Hodgkinson observed, "One reason that some rural citizens are not sure how good an educational system they want, as if their kids get too educated they might leave home."

Fundamentally, there is a persistent self-reinforcing cycle of poverty and low levels of educational attainment. One of the fundamental goals of education is to intervene, to break the intergenerational cycle. Generally, for our society as whole, history shows that education has been successful in meeting that goal. Schools have been successful in helping many rural

youngsters break the cycle. However, it is abundantly clear that we have fallen far short of success with significant numbers of children and youth in our most isolated rural regions.

The Special Needs of Rural Education

Education's success in rural areas has been limited for two reasons. The first is that too little attention has been paid to the special needs of rural schools. And the second is that rural schools, largely because of state policies, have been historically underfunded.

In Kentucky in 1989 per pupil expenditures among our local districts ranged from about $2,500 per pupil to more than $5,000 per pupil. Nearly all the districts at the bottom of the scale are rural, and all of those at the top are urban or suburban. Yet by state law, all districts are required to provide the same services and same opportunities to all children regardless of whether they live in urban, suburban or rural areas.

The inequities in spending for schools among districts was directly related to inequities in wealth among our districts. Our poorest district, a rural county district, had only $37,000 of taxable property per student while our wealthiest district, a suburban enclave, had $320,000 of taxable wealth per pupil. That's a nearly nine to one differential.

While rural districts have had fewer resources, simply because they are rural they face special difficulties in providing educational services.

One area is pupil transportation. In Kentucky, while most of our urban districts spend less than $100 per student on transportation, our rural districts spend from $200 per pupil to $325 per pupil simply to get students to school. If you subtract transportation costs from per pupil spending data, the inequities between what our districts spend for instruction are even greater.

Transportation has another important negative impact on rural children. A significant portion of our rural students ride busses more than two hours a day. And nobody can seriously argue that that is productive time.

The distances, the time involved and the expense involved with transporting rural students makes it more difficult to offer half-day preschool programs, after school programs family oriented services and parental involvement programs for rural students.

Rural districts also find it very difficult to provide the full range of special education services for low incident populations. While services for multiple handicaps or relatively rare learning disabilities are readily available in most urban areas, they are seldom available in rural districts.

While Kentucky has made significant strides in recent years in providing modern school facilities

throughout the state, we still have many old school buildings in rural areas that are obsolete by modern standards. These buildings simply do not provide the facilities necessary to operate a fully effective educational program.

(Ironically, as our rural districts replace older facilities with new, efficient, educationally adequate buildings, they exacerbate some of the problems we have described above. These include increased transportation costs, longer bus rides for students, and fewer opportunties for parental involvement.)

Many of our rural districts also experience chronic staffing problems. While we have no overall teacher shortage in Kentucky, and while urban districts are flooded with applications, our rural districts often have difficulty in finding qualified teachers in math, science, foreign languages, and special education. Instead of being able to hire the best from a pool of applicants, they frequently resort to employing whoever they can find.

The bottom line is that offering a full range of quality services costs more in rural districts, yet they have fewer resources.

Kentucky's Response

As a state, Kentucky has responded aggressively to the needs of rural districts in recent years. Six years ago, 66 of our local school districts, most of them rural and poor, challenged the state's school finance system in our courts. The result was a landmark decision by the Kentucky Supreme Court that declared the whole state system of public education unconstitutional. Our legislature responded in 1990 with the Kentucky Educational Reform Act, the nation's most comprehensive and most systemic attempt to transform schooling.

At the heart of our reform act is a new funding formula which has two very important features with respect to poor rural districts. First, the formula is designed to narrow the glaring gap in per pupil spending among poorer and wealthier districts over the next five years. By 1996 we will have achieved substantial equity in per pupil spending across the state. All children, regardless of where they live, will benefit from approximately the same number of educational dollars. That's a significant and important achievement.

Second, the finance formula recognizes that it costs more to provide poor children with equal educational opportunties. In our new formula, the per pupil allowance for children who quality for free lunches is 15 percent greater than the standard allowance. The primary beneficiaries of this feature are rural school districts. It is possible that in a few years some of our rural districts with high proportions of children in poverty will be spending more per pupil than some districts in more

affluent urban areas. This, too, is an important and significant achievement.

In addition to moving toward financial equity, Kentucky's reform act also made significant strides in providing special services that will benefit poor children in rural areas. The combination of these services weave a safety net to prevent failure and ensure success for every child.

First, the reform act created a statewide, state-funded preschool program for four-year-olds who quality for free lunches. This school year, our new preschool program and Head Start combined are now serving about 80 percent of our eligible four-year-olds. Again, rural children are major beneficiaries of this program because our state's poverty is concentrated in rural areas.

Second, our reform act established a statewide tutorial program for students who need additional instruction in order to meet achievement goals. These tutorial services are offered outside the regular instructional day and year. Most of our districts have some combination of before-school, after-school, Saturday and summer school programs. This program gives teachers and schools the opportunity to intervene quickly and effectively whenever a student begins to fall behind. Last year, our program served about a fourth of our total enrollment, and we expect that number to increase this year. It's a popular program among teachers, parents, and students. And the initial evaluations and performance indicators suggest that it is highly effective in preventing failure and improving achievement.

A third feature of the safety net is family and youth service centers to serve schools with high concentrations of children from low-income families. This year the state funded centers in about 10 percent of our schools, and the goal is to expand the program to all eligible schools over the next five years. These centers are not designed to be direct service providers. Rather, the staff of the centers serve as advocates for children who need social or medical services to increase their chances of success at school. The staff works to ensure that children and their families receive available services from existing service providers, to coordinate services among agencies, and to help bring new services to the community. Rural schools and rural children and their families will be primary beneficiaries.

The fourth element of the failure prevention safety net is the primary school program. Beginning in 1992 we will replace kindergarten through the third grade with a nongraded program designed to meet the developmental needs of each child. The program recognizes that the traditional graded structure does not recognize the fact that young children mature at varying ages and varying rates. This continuous progress approach will feature multi-age and

multi-ability grouping and will focus on the development of the whole child. The emphasis will be on the steady growth and success of each child, not on meeting an arbitrary standard of achievement based on a child's chronological age. This program will be particularly important in building the self esteem of rural children and providing them a foundation for continued success in school.

Beyond the safety net, Kentucky's reform act also establishes a state-of-the-art technology program designed to bring the best instructional technology into every classroom in our state. Kentucky already has a head start in this area through the facilities of Kentucky Educational Television. Every school is now equipped to receive instructional programs via satellite. Our new technology program will add an integrated, centralized computer network. Again rural schools will be primary beneficiaries. Isolated schools will be able to offer a wider range of courses, and teachers in rural schools will have easy access to a full range of professional development programs.

Kentucky's reform act makes two other fundamental changes that will improve opportunities for rural students. The first is a new set of student learning goals supported by a new curriculum and a new assessment system. The emphasis in all three is on performance. We are shifting from standardized, multiple choice, computer scored tests to performance tests. For example, instead of testing students on the rules of grammar as we have traditionally done, we will test their ability to write an essay. The emphasis will shift from knowing to doing, from memorization to the demonstration and application of skills. While this approach will benefit all students, it may provide the greatest benefits to rural children, who often seem to learn better and perform better on more concrete and less abstract learning exercises.

The second fundamental change is school-based decision making, which will be required in all schools by 1996. By then, all schools will be self-governed by a School Council consisting of three teacher, two parents and the principal. The school council will make decisions regarding curriculum, staffing, scheduling and other aspects of schooling that directly affect student performance. The essential philosophy underlying school-based decision making is that the people closest to students can make the best decisions regarding their needs. In our rural schools, school councils will be able to design and adapt programs to meet the unique needs of rural students. The results should be substantially better performance, less failure and greater success.

Kentucky has made a significant commitment to fundamentally reshaping its educational system and to transforming schooling. All students will benefit from our approach to reform, but rural children will be the primary beneficiaries Kentucky education reform.

The Federal Role

While Kentucky is proud of its own self-help efforts, we recognize the need for support in meeting the needs of children in our rural areas. We are primarily interested in educational needs and educational programs, but it is clear that education alone is not enough to break the intransigent intergenerational cycle of rural poverty. Our efforts must focus on the total needs of the child, including health care and family support. While we must begin with children and with educational programs, we need a comprehensive strategy for meeting the broader needs of rural communities. Educational efforts must be supported with greater economic development assistance, improvements to the rural infrastructure, and greater support for child health and social service programs, particularly for young families.

In terms of specific educational programs, let me suggest several ways that the federal government could support our efforts to better serve children living in our rural areas.

First is research. We need better information on what kinds of programs and services work best to meet the needs of rural students. There is no need for each state to attempt to reinvent the wheel. The regional educational laboratories have been of great assistance to us, but we need to increase support for them.

Second is technology. Satellites, television, fiber optics, telephones and computers offer great potential in bringing programs, information and services into remote and isolated rural schools. In Kentucky, we are now designing and developing a state system to link these different technologies together. Other states have similar needs and are moving in the same direction. Support for designing a system and implementing it in the most effective manner would be of great assistance.

Third is regulatory flexibility. While Kentucky is moving through school-based decision making to a decentralized, deregulated, results-oriented system of school governance that allows teachers, administrators and parents to design programs that work best in each school, they still must deal with inflexible federal programs. Allowing greater flexibility in the use of federal funds at the school level would give our school councils greater opportunties to meet the needs of their students.

Fourth is support for improving teaching. A national teacher corps or national teacher exchange program that would encourage our best teachers to work in rural areas would help our rural districts meet instructional needs and also bring some diversity into isolated rural communities.

Fifth is overall increased federal support for education. Kentucky is making significant strides in eliminating its intrastate funding inequities and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

increasing its overall support for schools. By the late 1980s Kentucky was spending, on one measure of tax effort, about the same as other states were: Per capita disposable personal income in Kentucky was about 80 percent of the national average and per pupil spending for elementary and secondary education was also about 80 percent. To address the intrastate inequity problem, last year the Kentucky legislature enacted the largest tax increase in state history and increased funding for elementary and secondary education by 20 percent in one year. Kentucky also normally ranks among the top 10 states in the percentage of education spending from federal sources. In spite of its own increased effort and its high rate of federal aid, Kentucky's per pupil spending rose to only 84 percent of the national average for the 1990-91 school year. The problem is interstate inequities, a problem that only the federal government can address.

Conclusion

As a rural and poor state, Kentucky certainly appreciates the attention that this committee is focusing on the needs of children and families living in rural areas. We support the concepts and the initiatives outlined in the Rural Schools of America Act of 1991. In addition, increased federal support for research, deregulation, technology, and staffing would assist us in meeting the needs of our rural students. So would any increase in aid to education targeted to children from low income families. While we are proud of our own efforts to reshape our schools and improve opportunities for our rural children, we welcome and support increased federal support designed to bring equal educational opportunities to children in rural America.

Thank you very much for your attention to this most important issue.

50-273 0 - 92 - 2

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you very much. Mr. Lestina. Dale.

Mr. LESTINA. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I am Dale Lestina, Chair of a coalition known as OCRE. That is call letters for Organizations Concerned About Rural Education.

Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I would like to submit my written testimony for the record, and verbally highlight it and augment it here this morning.

Chairman KILDEE. Without objection.

Mr. LESTINA. Mr. Chairman, OCRE is a coalition of national organizations representing education, rural technological interests, representing over 18 million American citizens here before you this morning.

On page 1, the second paragraph of my testimony is a list of those national organizations that are dues paying members to OCRE. It includes the normal organizations that this committee is well aware of that represent education.

But in addition to that, it includes organizations such as NAOC, the National Association of Counties, the National Farm Union, the National Grange, the Rural Electric Co-ops, the Rural Telephone Co-ops, Triangle Coalition, which is a coalition primarily concerned with math and science education, and U.S. West Communications.

OCRE's mission is to promote collaboration among and between national organizations, Federal agencies, and State agencies on rural education and rural economic revitalization issues.

OCRE has three main interlocking goals. The first is rural public school curriculum reform. Keeping what is best in the existing industrial model of seat work and lecture, but adding to that the higher maths, critical thinking skills, and foreign languages as examples.

To accomplish this kind of goal, however, takes community support. And that leads us to our second goal, which is rural public schools developing as rural community centers, to strengthen and assist as it can in the economic revitalization of rural communities.

Now the public school structure in the rural communities is often the last bastion of structure that remains, in that rural hospitals are, for all intents and purposes, gone, left the rural areas.

And the rural public schools can provide through its structure a great service to communities, such as day care, pre-school, kindergarten, and the normal kinds of things we think of when we associate school services for school age children, but also adult programs and programs for individuals who are retired.

In addition to that, for community service OCRE is exploring well-care, vaccination programs, health care, and transportation services, utilizing school buses for more than just transporting children to and from school in the morning and the afternoon. All of that takes bucks, takes money, calls for taxes, and that calls for a tax base from which to draw it.

That is an area that is diminishing in the rural areas. And along with the tax base, of course, are jobs. Now schools, public rural schools is a heavy tax liability for rural communities. And what OCRE is interested in is in assisting changing that to also an asset for rural community revitalization, which takes then us to the

third goal. And the third goal is community economic revitalization and the roles that rural public schools can play in it.

I would like you to join me in kind of a fantasy for a minute. Let's pretend we are eavesdropping on a family, rural family, mother and father talking to their children, and the essence of the thing would probably go something like this. "Sons and daughters, there is nothing here for you. You will, if you are going to be a success, get your education, but you will have to go somewhere else. You can't stay here."

OCRE's concern is one of providing at least an option, so that in order to be viewed as a success the individuals would not have to be perceived and have the mind set of having to leave that community. This is where H.R. 2819, the Rural Schools Act, comes in with flying colors.

The OCRE coalition and the organizations that are members of it see it as just a great bill. And it augments very well the kinds of goals that I have just addressed that are OCRE's goals. OCRE at the present time is involved in what we consider to be a transplantable rural project, utilizing rural schools, attempting to increase tax base and jobs in the State of North Dakota.

The major players are OCRE, as I have described it to you, and OCRE's State affiliates, as well as the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction, North Dakota State University, and MCREL. MCREL, the Mid-Continental Regional Educational Laboratory, one of the Department of Education's research laboratories, is located in Denver.

The areas that we are exploring really can be summarized in four quick statements, as to how rural schools can assist in moving toward the national goals and help bring economic revitalization in the area of agri business and food processing.

At the present time in rural States the wheat, soy bean, sunflower seeds, are put on a truck or a train and they are transported somewhere else, out of the State or out of the region, where value is added to them. Given today's technology, that doesn't necessarily have to be the case, and the schools adjusting curriculum can teach toward the jobs that would be associated with such an endeavor.

The third area is energy, coal and oil. Most rural States have got some of that. And utilizing the research universities in the State, looking for new kinds of products from coal and oil, such as surface coverings and paints and varnishes, which the North Dakota State University is doing, along with that, are businesses that can be located there, and jobs.

The fourth area is services that go with the first two. Services such as educational services, well-care services, technical services, transportation services, all which can be related to rural public schools.

And the last one is the kinds of things that come along with economic advancement, and that is good high quality light manufacturing that relates to the first three. High quality manufacturing. Better farm implement, let's make it there. A better way to mine the coal, let's look at that, that kind of equipment there. Develop computer software. It can be done. Those jobs and those businesses do not need to be somewhere else.

Underlying all four of those that I have just mentioned, there are two things that I would like to highlight. One of those is technology. And the schools can be involved in that technology deeply. In that whether we are talking about ag, business, energy, services, or manufacturing, one needs to learn how to install the technology, how to use it, and how to repair it: all things that schools can teach toward and do.

Now the human resources that goes along with this—and that is needed. All without exception. I know of no small rural town that wishes to lose its school. And those schools can be kept through the utilization of distance learning technology, two-way distance learning technology, utilizing the digital analog system.

At the present time, graduates from rural high schools may go to colleges and universities, many of them find themselves in difficulty being able to compete at that level. Not because of a lack of intelligence, but because of lack of exposure to the higher critical thinking skills, higher maths, foreign languages that are needed to compete at that level. And so several drop out.

And then those that go on to graduate, if you take a State like North Dakota, that we are working with, 60 to 70 percent of those take their first job out of State and they don't come back. And if you take an area such as engineering, it is over 90 percent that takes their first job out of State.

So we have rural States that are exporting their raw resources and also exporting their people, and those that are left behind working hard to raise the taxes to continue this kind of cycle. It is not a good cycle.

Therefore, in utilizing distance learning technologies, we can expose rural students to the kinds of things that I have been talking about. When a rural inventor or small business is beginning to start up, and students are beginning to think about whether in their jobs they are going to be an employer or an employee, they can get exposed to market research. That is out of the question now, market research for rural areas.

And so the project that we are presently working on is funded through the U.S. Department of Agriculture and its Youth at Risk Intercultural Extension Funding, and we are in the process of attempting to secure other funds. But it is difficult to come by. Money is tight when it comes to obtaining grants, and it is not long range.

When we look at H.R. 2819, the Rural Schools Act, as submitted by Congressman Perkins, we have an excellent bill to provide those kinds of funds on an ongoing basis that really covers four areas very nicely. The bill covers projects like I have just described, in moving rural schools toward the six national goals.

It also provides funds for updating school physical facilities and providing ways in which we can enter into the distance learning technology. It provides for good research, and it provides for raising the priority of rural public schools.

Mr. Chairman, one out of every four students in the rural public schools comes from a family below the poverty line. Teacher shortages are very great in rural schools, and the physical facilities are in bad shape.

H.R. 2819, which I can't speak too highly of, would provide financial assistance for rural schools to promote their national goals, close the achievement gap, improve curriculum, encourage community and parental, and rural business collaboration to assist with rural school economic revitalization.

It provides $1.5 billion for initial grants for 3 years, with an option for those grants to be renewed for 3 more years. And it also has a very nice feature that we like, and that the LEAs have established an advisory group similar to the stake holders in legislation that has just passed through this committee, of educators, bargaining unit educators, parents, State and local officials, to assist with representatives of rural business to assist in planning and assessment.

It also has a feature in the third Title that would establish in each region a national rural regional research center, which would be operated by the Education Department's Regional Education Laboratories, to evaluate the effectiveness, monitor the programs, and conduct research, disseminate information, and provide grants for research directly to local education agencies.

In conclusion, it also elevates the priority of rural education which is so lacking today. It establishes an interagency council on rural schools consisting of various Cabinet members and Federal officials here in Washington, DC.

It also establishes a National Commission on Rural Education, bipartisan in nature, appointed by the President and Congress, and it establishes a White House conference and an Assistant Secretary for Education.

In conclusion, education is moving to the top of national agenda. But so far, little meaningful attention has been focused on the plight of America's rural school students and its rural school systems.

H.R. 2819 would go a long ways in that direction, in assisting and helping with this problem. For the rural children, many of them in isolated regions, education is the only opportunity to change their lives. And given, as we have discussed before, our national economic global competition, we simply cannot afford to overlook any brain pool, and that includes the brain pool in a rural America.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to testify.

[The prepared statement of Dale Lestina follows:]

OCRE

ORGANIZATIONS CONCERNED ABOUT RURAL EDUCATION

TESTIMONY
OF THE
ORGANIZATIONS CONCERNED ABOUT RURAL EDUCATION
ON THE
RURAL SCHOOLS OF AMERICA ACT OF 1991
H.R.2819

BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

PRESENTED BY DALE LESTINA
CHAIRMAN, OCRE

NOVEMBER 14, 1991

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am Dale Lestina, Legislative Specialist for the National Education Association, which represents more than two million education employees in the nation's public elementary, secondary, vocational, and postsecondary schools. In addition, I am speaking as the chair of Organizations Concerned about Rural Education (OCRE) whose member organizations represent more than 18 million Americans involved in education, agriculture, and technology. I appreciate this opportunity to speak with you today about the need to make a substantial investment in rural America, with an emphasis on the role that public schools can play in economic and community development.

The OCRE coalition includes the American Association of School Administrators, American Federation of Teachers, Council for Educational Development and Research, National Association of Counties, National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association, National Farmers Union, National Grange, National Rural Education Association, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, National School Boards Association, National Telephone Cooperative Association, National Vocational Agricultural Teachers Association, Triangle Coalition for Science and Technology Education, and U.S. West.

OCRE and NEA strongly support the Rural Schools of America Act of 1991, H.R. 2819, as an essential means to

provide the resources for schools to expand and diversify their role in community and economic development.

Public elementary and secondary schools play a pivotal role in American rural communities. To a large extent, the school is what brings the community together -- given the relative isolation of families working in agriculture and ranching.

Much has been written about the decline of rural America in terms of population. In 1950, 44 percent of the U.S. population lived in nonmetropolitan areas; by 1987, only 23 percent of the population lived in nonmetropolitan areas. But not enough attention has been given to the vitality of rural America, to the values of rural America, or to the concerns and needs of rural America as a national resource.

OCRE was organized to advance three interlocking goals. The first goal is school reform in rural schools -- moving away from a curriculum that is focused solely on lecture and "seat work" toward a more rigorous curriculum that includes foreign language and higher mathematics, and that emphasizes critical thinking and other higher order skills. The second goal is to enhance the ability of public schools to serve as community centers that offer a broad range of services, including child care, adult education, recreation, transportation, and coordination of social services, such as immunization programs. The third goal is to enhance economic development. By bringing about economic

revitalization, members of OCRE hope to stop the outmigration of rural America's youth, enhance the economic and social viability of the community, and build a more stable base of support for future education and community development efforts.

OCRE's goals are oriented toward both current and future needs. Economic constraints create a need for innovation in the delivery of public services. People living in rural communities recognize the need to use existing facilities more effectively. And since the public schools are institutions that are already widely recognized as central to the community, they are ideal facilities for locating adult education, health care, and transportation services.

But our goals go beyond immediate concerns. In an effort to assure future generations a place in the community, people living in rural America recognize that they must diversify their economy in a variety of ways. At present, young people who grow up in rural America have few opportunities. From 60 to 70 percent of all college graduates who come from rural areas pursue job opportunities out of state and never return. Moreover, some 90 percent of all engineering graduates never return to their rural community of origin.

We cannot reverse this trend by calling on young people to lower their ambitions. We must expand opportunity. The

most likely place to start is in technologies and industries that have proven fertile.

Of necessity, workers in the agricultural and energy fields have developed significant innovations in technology. What has been missing is the ability to capitalize on that technology within the originating community. In addition, most agricultural areas are focused only on growing food, shipping it elsewhere to be processed. By expanding the food processing capability in locations where food is grown, value is added, making our economy more productive and expanding and diversifying the economy of the community.

OCRE is committed to enhancing both education and community development in ways that make it possible for people to create new products and services, and consequently new jobs and markets.

At present, OCRE is involved in a pilot project in cooperation with the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction, North Dakota State University Extension, and Mid-continent Research and Education Laboratory in Denver, Colorado.

In this demonstration project, a number of regional consortia have been established to guide school reform and community development. Each consortium has established a council made up of teachers and business and community leaders to develop plans for working on education, health care delivery, improvement of fire protection, or water systems.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

One important element of the school improvement component is the involvement of students in experiential learning opportunities that help draw linkages between information and its application in the world of work, as well as linkages between the school and others in the community. Through these projects, students can learn how to do market surveys, develop business plans, find out about licensing, taxes, and keeping accounts.

At the same time, in cooperation with the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory, North Dakota public schools have established links with other schools, including postsecondary educational institutions, within the state and in the seven-state region served by the Mid-continent lab. By sharing use of computers, instructors, and other resources, participating schools can expand the diversity and enhance the quality of educational offerings.

The North Dakota experience is well worth replication on a national scale. That's why NEA and OCRE strongly support the Rural Schools of America Act, introduced by representative Carl Perkins (D-KY). H.R. 2819 would authorize $3 billion in FY92 and such sums as necessary over the eight years of the authorization to help defray the costs of rural development programs. Funds provided under the bill would be used for innovative educational projects, capital improvement, and school-community linkages.

Resources provided under the Act could be used for a variety of programs that would advance the National

Education Goals, set forth by the nation's governors and endorsed by President Bush, and accomplish local education priorities in the areas of effective schools, academic enrichment, enhanced student motivation, extending the school day or school year, and providing inservice education for teachers and other school employees.

Moreover, the Rural Schools Act would help pay for comprehensive early childhood development programs, parenting education and parental involvement activities, collaborative efforts with health and social services agencies, and raising standards for early childhood education programs.

Educational improvement is not merely a goal by itself. It is a central element of any strategy to achieve the full range of our national goals, including national security, economic vitality, and equal opportunity. Americans living in rural communities face unique circumstances, including scant resources, that require federal action to help overcome.

To give you some idea, the population of the District of Columbia itself, excluding the metropolitan area, is comparable to the population of the state of North Dakota, about 626,000 to 672,000 respectively. And yet, the population of the District of Columbia is concentrated within 67 square miles. By comparison, the citizens of North Dakota are scattered over some 70,665 miles. Clearly,

that sparse density creates enormous challenges in terms of transportation and communications.

Much progress has been made in recent years through distance learning and "circuit riding" teachers that make efficient use of human resources. But such innovative teaching methods do require resources. The Rural Schools Act would help facilitate such programs.

Another area of need is directly related to the overall "brain drain" caused by the outmigration of college-educated rural Americans. Rural schools face acute teacher shortages in significant areas -- both geographic and academic. Frequently, because there is a smaller pool of qualified individuals available to teach in certain academic areas, rural schools are more likely to have persons teaching outside of their area of background. The Rural Schools Act would help fund teacher education and recruitment programs that would help assure a qualified teacher in every classroom.

In addition, the Rural Schools Act would help bring together people from diverse backgrounds to collaborate on the complex issues of school improvement and community development. At the local level, partnerships would be created among school employees, social service providers, business leaders, and others to identify and address local needs. At the same time, the measure would establish a national conference, require an Assistant Secretary of Education for Rural Education, and create a Congressional

advisory committee to review needs, identify strategies, and recognize successes.

America must not delay in recognizing the need to strengthen rural communities and maintain a way of life that is central to the American experience -- and a major factor in our national success. We urge you to support this legislation and appropriations to fund it, not only for the preservation of rural America but for the continued vitality of these United States.

Thank you.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. Lestina.

Dr. Prophet.

Mr. PROPHET. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am indeed honored by the wonderful introduction given to me by Congressman AuCoin, and I certainly have always admired you, Congressman Kildee. I still do.

And I hope there is something that this committee can do to help us with what I believe all of America regards as a very, very serious problem that is pervasive throughout our country. I am going to try to describe that to you, and maybe in ways that the American people have not heard before. We have heard a lot about statistics. I have got a talk here that admittedly had been prepared for delivery in somewhat of a literate or literary sense, to read to you, but I am going to depart from that, and I am probably going to commit the egregious sin of having come before a Congressional Committee with people having told you what to say, how to say it, the bills to talk about, how they all interrelate.

I have all that here. It is in our testimony. We have a Superintendent here from Tucson, Arizona who is very outstanding, who knows all of that. And we have Michael Casserly from the Council Grade City Schools, who is the Associate Director, who if there are questions about any of the relationships at all about those bills and what we need, and what we want, we can certainly convey that to you.

So I am going to commit the unpardonable egregious commission, and probably unprecedented crime of departing from my script.

Chairman KILDEE. It may be an egregious virtue to do that.

Mr. PROPHET. Yes. And just let you know.

Chairman KILDEE. We will submit your entire written testimony and you may present it any way you wish.

Mr. PROPHET. Yes, sir. Let you know how I feel about American education. I came into education in 1971, upon retiring from military service after 20 years, as a colonel, and entered into what I treasure as the most wonderful decision I could have ever made.

I have worked with thousands of young people in Lansing, and in Portland, and around this country. I admire them. I admire the teachers of this country. I admire our Nation. I have fought for it in two wars and will fight for it again.

But I think, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that there is a terrible propensity in our country toward the creation of a condition of irreconcilable disenfranchisement on the part of students and kids in America that may, in fact, cause this country to get into a condition from which we may never recover.

I believe that they are being disenfranchised because of the shortsightedness of many of us in America. I am not here to point fingers at anyone, but I will say this to you, that from the period 1971 to 1981, Mr. Chairman, as the Deputy Superintendent in the Lansing, Michigan school system and as the Superintendent in that school system, I saw appreciable improvements and increases and substantial additional resources given to us to help our kids in America. I saw a portion of the Federal budget that was being dedicated to education, and as a percentage of what we needed to educate our kids, grow reasonably measurably. Then I began to see, upon leaving Lansing and going to Portland, almost a total deterio-

ration of that particular condition, which has now caused school systems such as Dr. Garcia's, school systems such as Mr. Jefferson's in New Orleans, and I know Edward Williams very, very well. And I could name any of the school systems.

I happened in the past year to have had the honor of being selected to serve as the President of the Superintendents of this country and of Canada. And I will say to you that of the 65 people who were represented there as superintendents I would venture to say that 55 to 60 of them would say the same thing if they had the honor, as I have been extended, to talk to you. And they would say to you that this country must do something to help the youth in the urban centers.

Let me tell you why I believe it. I believe it, first of all, because while admittedly the Federal Government can perhaps justifiably in a constitutional sense say they have nothing to do, or they don't really need to provide additional support to public education.

They could probably do that because as one reads the Constitution of the United States, I don't even think the word education is even mentioned, except that you probably could relegate or interpret the contents of the Constitution to say that the Federal Government should do more to help us.

By looking at the 10th Amendment, when it says that all of those things that the Federal Government does not have power to do are hereby relegated to the States. But the Federal Government, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, on many occasions when this Nation has been at risk, has in fact entered into education. It has entered into it with the Smith-Hughes Act, in order to have vocational rehabilitation.

It has entered into education via the GI Bill after World War II, which served to educate people at a time when that is all that they had to save themselves after returning to an economy which had not yet undergone a re-industrialization from a war time economy to a different kind of economy for peace time.

It entered into it in terms of the Judicial Branch in the Brown v. Board of Education. And there have been other times. In 1965, Elementary, Secondary Education Act, that the Federal Government has entered into it.

But I have seen the deterioration of Federal Governmental support for education. Let me tell you what that is causing. It is causing a situation where as a local superintendent, as a person responsible for some 56,000 young people in the city of Portland, I find myself scrambling to get whatever assistance I can, from wherever I can, in order to do what I am sworn to do as the Chief Executive Officer of that particular school district.

We have to ask the State for additional assistance. But the State cannot help us. The State would help us, I think, if it had the wherewithal to do so. But even to the extent that the State does help us, we receive a very measurably disproportionate percentage of support for the urban students in Portland than is received in suburban areas and other areas.

I would say that the State cannot help us because they, themselves, are attempting to implement many of the reforms that have been declared by the President and by our Governors. But these reforms, sir, that have been declared and enunciated by the Presi-

dent, comes without any kind of fiscal support. And we are burdened in the local school systems to try to implement many of them.

So what do we do? We are trying to forge and to formulate new alliances, new allegiances with other institutions of government. Why is it necessary for us to form alliances and allegiances with other institutions of government? It is necessary because we believe among us, as the superintendents of this country, that the longstanding, highly effective functioning institutions in many areas of society have now begun to deteriorate.

We believe that many of the institutions in our society have now become dysfunctional. We believe the institutions created in the 1930's, and probably modified later on to provide social services to people, to provide care for them, to provide help, to provide housing, to provide employment, that it is not working.

And to the extent that it doesn't work, we in the schools become the receptacle and the recipient for the failures of every single other institution in America.

When you read about what we are doing and what we aren't doing, you always read about, and the public and the press always hears and covers, what the schools are not doing in terms of recognition of youngsters, whether youngsters are learning or not learning.

What you don't hear enough about is that schools are asked to do all those things that other institutions are failing to do. We are asked, sir, to feed hungry kids. We are asked to teach kids the ills of drug and alcohol abuse. We are asked to prevent AIDS. We are asked to integrate neighborhoods who don't want to be integrated.

We are asked to do every single thing that our entire social structure is designed to do. It falls upon us. So if we are asked to do those things, we then have to build new institutional configurations.

We are asked to receive and to accept and to provide a superior education to immigrants from nations that we have never heard of before. We don't even know when they are coming. We are asked to provide education to young people who are being turned out of institutions, who in the 1930's and 1940's would have been in institutions for health and for mental health. They are now being placed into our public schools.

We are not saying that is not our job. We want to do it very desperately, but we need your help. What have we done? We have brought together the 47 entities that comprise the Council of Great City Schools. The superintendents of those school systems, their board members, have collaborated and cooperated with Mr. Sam Husk, who is their director, also with Connie Clayton, the Superintendent of Philadelphia, who is the current President, and with Mr. Michael Casserly. And we have put together the bill which is before you.

Mr. Chairman, I know you want to hear more about how that particular bill functions. That is going to be told to you by my colleagues. But I do come to you to say that while we are asking for help, that is not to say that we have not made tremendous progress during the course of the last decade, even though Federal assistance has dwindled.

Dr. Garcia and I, and others, can indicate to you and tell you many things that have occurred that would really startle the American people and in many, many ways is antithetical to many of the reports that the President has issued, many of the reports that the Secretary of Education has issued.

We know, for example, I understand before this very committee you had input that has come from the Sandia Laboratory in Albuquerque, New Mexico, who has told you that a lot of mythology about the failures of education in America are simply that; they are mythologies.

We have made tremendous progress. I will give you one example, and I will close. We have in Portland, for example, Mr. Chairman, we have raised the achievement of our minority youngsters from what existed in 1981 from the 25th percentile to the 54th percentile.

Now that doesn't say very much except it almost represents more than 100 percent improvement. But even then, they are still only at the national average, and we cannot survive as a Nation and as a society only functioning in an average form.

I appreciate the opportunity that you have extended to me. I simply wanted to convey to you the seriousness that we take this task. And I know that this committee is one of the most supportive in this Congress, and of all the committees that are here, I admire what you are trying to do. I admire the bill that you, yourself, have derived and think that that can serve as a very firm foundation upon which other kinds of things can be incorporated.

Thank you for the opportunity. I would now like to defer to my cohort in education, Dr. George Garcia, the Superintendent of Schools in Tucson, Arizona. Thank you, sir.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you, Dr. Prophet. Just one comment. Your testimony triggered a thought in my own mind. I have worried for some time now—and there is no need to answer this, but I just worried for some time now that in this Nation we are in danger, or indeed in the process of, creating a permanent underclass in this country.

We have never had that before, but I really see that, particularly when I go through some of the cities in which we find so many problems not being addressed, educational and societal problems that really are in danger of creating a permanent underclass caused by drugs, by poverty, by crime and by lack of parenting skills from one generation to another.

We are in the process of doing that, and that is a terrible legacy to leave. It is a moral problem in this country too, and I think you have touched upon that very well—more than touched upon it in your testimony. I thank you for that.

Mr. PROPHET. Thank you, sir.

Chairman KILDEE. Dr. Garcia?

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You are exactly correct, and that is why we are here in support of the Urban Schools of American Act. We believe that the Urban Schools of America Act can be the foundation for a new Marshall Plan, a domestic Marshall Plan that will transition us to a larger comprehensive program from the Federal level to address the issues of large cities as it relates to urban education.

Important features of the U.S. bill include: comprehensive and systematic local program based on achieving the national goals rather than on specific categories of children; flexibility to design local programs that could best meet the national goals; an unprecedented accountability provision that would cut off USA funds if a school did not make progress towards the goals according to pre-set criteria; incentive grants to schools that make unusually high progress towards the goals, remove barriers to student achievement, and reform for the future.

Dr. Prophet cited examples in Portland. We have also examples, and Tucson, and in every large city school district in this country has examples of success that we need to reinforce and reward and support:

sufficient size and scale to make a real difference; the possibility of waiving certain regulations that might impede student achievement; collaboration with the wide variety of community-based parent and private-sector organizations; resources to repair and renovate our dilapidated school buildings; and funds for evaluating and assessing progress on the goals.

Why this bill, and why now? First, the legislation is designed to dovetail with one of the Nations most important new educational demands, the need to move critical decisions down to those closest to the children.

While the administration in the States are receiving most of the media attention, it is the cities which are now and have been for some time pioneering ways to do this.

Chicago is highly publicized in terms of its decentralized, parent/community run schools. New York City public schools are also engaged in school-based management, and Miami, Dade County has experienced successful side-based management for over a decade.

Philadelphia, Toledo, Pittsburgh, San Diego, Rochester, Memphis, Seattle, and many other cities, including Tucson, have been working toward side-based management for some time.

Secondly, the legislation is designed to address the growing insistence of accountability for results. The Nation's parents, taxpayers, and business community are correct in demanding a return on their investment.

The USA bill speaks to this demand by stating that the funds should be cut off if progress is not evident. No other piece of Federal legislation has gone as far as this.

Third, the USA bill adopts one of the good ideas from President Bush's education package by rewarding success. If a low-achieving school makes unusual progress towards the goal, then it gets extra resources. If a low-achieving school system removes barriers for children's learning, then it is rewarded. If a poor school system restructures itself to meet the needs of the children more effectively, it is provided additional funds.

Fourth, the bill is large enough and targeted enough to make a difference. It sends money only to the Nation's hardest pressed inner city school systems, about 90 in count as we see it, and, within those systems, to the lowest achieving and poorest schools to conduct school-wide improvement activities. The kinds of things that Dr. Prophet referred to are indeed real in the inner city, and

we need to concentrate additional resources in those particular schools.

Furthermore, it helps fill the enormous gap between what the States are able to fund and what the inner city schools lack. It is, therefore, cost efficient at a time when the Federal Government is concerned about its deficit, but preserves the historic Federal role of serving those most in need.

Finally, the USA bill offers comprehensive and fundamental assistance. It seeks to improve the entire urban community in assisting its children, including parents, colleges and universities, businesses, labor, government, community-based groups, and other agencies.

Dr. Prophet spoke about the need to form new configurations, and that is exactly what this segment of the bill attempts to do. It does so in a way that significantly broadens the current Federal strategy of targeting and based solely on demographic characteristics of students.

The USA bill builds on that approach by tying all these efforts and their supporters together in a grand plan for our schools' improvement.

In general, urban schools have demonstrated that additional investment is worth the cost. Each of the major cities can point to programs that are making a real difference in the lives of young people.

And national studies, such as those conducted by the National Assessment on Educational Progress, show that academic achievement is greatest among city and poor rural students who are receiving the benefits of targeted Federal assistance.

Mr. Chairman, the urban schools of this Nation asks you, the Congress, to join with us to renew our historic vows on behalf of the neediest among us.

We are asking that through the USA bill we have a broadened strategy and an enhanced investment in improving schools where improvement is most necessary—the inner cities. We are asking that Congress seize the initiative in moving those towards our national goals.

The USA bill urges that you build on the current Federal strategy, not through additional competitive grant programs, but through comprehensive services. It discourages systems that are self-protective and encourages collaboration. It asks for money but demands results, and it does so through an image of educational democracy that is unprecedented.

We ask no less of you than we ask of ourselves, our teachers, our parents, and our students. Help us help the children who need us most desperately, and who want most painfully to be part of the American dream, but who believe that it is well beyond their reach.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes our testimony. We will be happy to answer any questions that the committee may have.

[The prepared statement of Matthew Prophet and George Garcia follows:]

THE COUNCIL OF THE GREAT CITY SCHOOLS
1413 K Street, N.W., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005 / (202) 371-0163

Anchorage
Atlanta
Baltimore
Boston
Buffalo
Chicago
Cincinnati
Cleveland
Columbus
Dade County
Dallas
Dayton
Denver
Detroit
East Baton Rouge
El Paso
Fresno
Houston
Indianapolis
Jacksonville
Long Beach
Los Angeles
Memphis
Milwaukee
Minneapolis
Nashville
New Orleans
New York City
Norfolk
Oakland
Oklahoma City
Omaha
Philadelphia
Phoenix
Pittsburgh
Portland
Rochester
St. Louis
St. Paul
Sacramento
San Diego
San Francisco
Seattle
Toledo
Tucson
Tulsa
Washington, D.C.

Testimony
on the

"URBAN SCHOOLS OF AMERICA (USA) ACT"
(H.R.1669)

before the
Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education

of the
Committee on Education and Labor
U.S. House of Representatives

Presented by

Matthew W. Prophet
Superintendent of Schools
Portland Public Schools

and

George Garcia
Superintendent of Schools
Tucson Public Schools

On behalf of
The Council of the Great City Schools

November 14, 1991
Washington, D.C.

Testimony on the
"Urban Schools of America (USA) Act" (H.R.1669)
before the
Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education
of the
Committee on Education and Labor
U.S. House of Representatives
On behalf of
The Council of the Great City Schools

Mr. Chairman, my name is Matthew Prophet. I am the Superintendent of the Portland Public Schools, the 59th largest of the nation's 15,000 public school systems and the largest school system in Oregon. And I am George Garcia, the Superintendent of the Tucson Unified School District, the nation's 58th largest public school system and the second largest in Arizona. We are pleased to appear before you this morning on behalf of our cities and as members of the Board of Directors of the Council of the Great City Schools.

Currently in its 35th year, the Council of the Great City Schools is a national organization comprised of 48 of the nation's largest urban public school systems. Its Board of Directors is comprised of the Superintendent and one Board of Education member from each city, making the Council the only education group so constituted and the only one whose membership and purpose is solely urban.

The Council's membership serves over 5.4 million inner-city youths or 13.3% of the nation's public school enrollment. Approximately 36% of the nation's African-American children, 31% of its Hispanic-American children and 21% of the nation's Asian-American children are being educated in our schools.

Mr. Chairman, we thank you for the invitation to speak before this crucial Subcommittee about the "Urban Schools of America (USA) Act" (H.R.1669) and for your continuing leadership in elementary and secondary education. We would also like to extend our deep appreciation to Congressman William Jefferson (D-LA) for assuming the chief sponsorship of the "USA" bill and for his advocacy on its behalf. Finally, we would like to thank the 86 members of the House who have already co-sponsored the "USA" bill, the 56 national organizations that have endorsed it, and the urban and rural communities for joining to meet their unique needs.

Before I begin, I would like to call your attention to a report that the Council published last fall, *Results 2000: Progress in Meeting Urban Education Goals*. It describes the headway urban schools are making but concludes that our current upward trajectory is insufficient to attain the national education goals by the year 2000 without additional specially-designed assistance.

Mr. Chairman, the Council of Great City Schools applauds the Committee for taking the necessary legislative steps to respond to the President's "America 2000" challenge. The "Neighborhood Schools Act" (H.R.3320), recently approved by this Committee, is a critical tool for pursuing the national goals through systemic state-wide education reform and an important preface to a larger discussion about what comes next in the federal role in national education reform.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

We believe the federal role in education must expand towards becoming an equal partner in the nation's education responsibilities by linking current categorical programs and statewide reforms with large scale federal support of local efforts in moving towards the national goals. This effort is particularly needed in poor urban and rural schools, the very school systems around which much of the reform debate is focused, and the ones whose success or failure will determine whether the nation meets its goals by the year 2000 -- if ever.

It is clear that any national education reform movement cannot succeed without significant progress in inner city schools. Urban school enrollments comprise too large a share of the nation's total student body to write off. Yet, the litany of urban school ailments is familiar: low student achievement, illiteracy, dropouts, homelessness, discipline problems, teen pregnancy, substance abuse, and violence fester in the inner cities. Deteriorating school buildings, lack of adequate teaching materials, dwindling financial resources, and shortages of qualified and committed teachers, principals, and support staff further complicate the unstable conditions of urban schools and communities. Furthermore, these burdens are borne in disproportionate numbers by the children of African-American and Hispanic parents, those with limited-English-proficiency, and those who live within poverty stricken inner cores of America's major cities. These problems have not been exaggerated.

The concentration and scale of need among children in the cities is unprecedented and unique. Nearly 60% of our enrollments qualify for free and reduced price lunches, over

12% are limited-English proficient, about 11% are disabled, 73% are African-American, Hispanic or Asian, and nearly half come from single parent families. On average, our school buildings are over 50 years old, and our ability to provide programs we know make a difference -- like preschool development, dropout prevention, in-service teacher training and health care -- are severely constrained by a lack of resources.

The federal government continues to be critical in providing those resources, but the total federal effort has slipped badly over the last ten years to an average of only 6.1% of total school revenues. State revenues, on the other hand, comprise a larger share of school funding but it is still a little more in cities than one would expect on a per student basis. Portland, for instance, enrolls 11.8% of Oregon's students including almost 15% of its poor students yet receives only 7.6% of the state's elementary and secondary expenditures. New York enrolls 36.4% of the state's students including over 60% of its poor children yet receives only 33% of the state's expenditures for schools.

City residents are desperately trying to compensate by increasing local tax rates but by doing so it leaves the poor to pay for themselves in an ever increasing spiral of "municipal overburden." While many cities appear to be property rich, much of the tax on the land has been abated to keep businesses from moving out. The consequence of both a population more expensive to serve and inadequate to finance is a smaller average per pupil expenditure in the cities and a lower share of it devoted to instructional services. Basically, the nation is getting what it's paying for in urban education.

-4-

STATUS OF URBAN SCHOOLS ON GOALS

Goal 1: *Academic Achievement*

- Disadvantaged urban students in 1988 scored 19.8 points below the national average on NAEP reading tests among nine year olds, 18.5 points below among 13 year olds, and 15.1 points below among 17 year olds.

- The median urban school system S.A.T. composite score was 862 in 1988; the national average was 904.

Goal 2: *Readiness to Learn*

- Urban preschool children have 50% less access to early childhood development programs as do their suburban counterparts.

- Average large city infant mortality rate is 13.2 deaths per 1,000 live births compared to the national average of 10.1 per 1,000.

Goal 3: *Graduation Rates*

- The dropout rate for central cities is 78% higher than suburbs and 63% higher than non-metropolitan areas.

Goal 4: *Postsecondary Opportunities*

- Average annual unemployment rate for youth aged 16-19 in central cities is about 24% compared with 15% in the suburbs.

- 75% of all new jobs between now and the year 2000 will be in the suburbs.

Goal 5: *Teachers*

- Shortages of teachers for urban schools are 2.5 times greater than the other kinds of school systems.

- The average urban school enrollment is 72.3% African-American, Hispanic-American, or Asian-American, yet 70% of the teaching force is white.

- Urban schools provide instructional services in approximately 120 languages.

Goal 6: *Health and Safety*

- 75% of urban school buildings are over 25 years old; 33% are over 50 years old, the repair and renovation of which would require $5 billion.

URBAN SCHOOL SHARE OF STATE-WIDE TOTALS

City	Elem./Sec. Expenditures	Poverty Enrollment[1]	Total Enrollment
Anchorage	30.4%	40.0%	NA
Atlanta	6.3	12.6	5.8
Baltimore	12.7	47.4	16.2
Boston	5.5	18.8	7.3
Buffalo	2.4	3.1	1.8
Chicago	28.0	54.4	23.2
Cincinnati	3.3	6.6	2.9
Cleveland	6.7	12.3	4.1
Columbus	3.9	7.2	3.7
Dade County	17.3	16.8	15.3
Dallas	1.7	6.1	3.9
Dayton	2.2	3.9	1.7
Denver	4.6	22.9	10.7
Detroit	18.2	31.8	11.1
East Baton Rouge	6.9	4.6	7.3
El Paso	2.1	5.4	1.7
Fresno	1.3	1.4	1.4
Houston	4.0	9.4	5.9
Indianapolis	5.8	16.3	5.2
Jacksonville	6.4	6.3	NA
Long Beach	1.6	1.8	1.5
Los Angeles	16.0	18.2	13.2
Memphis	10.8	22.2	12.9
Milwaukee	17.6	26.4	12.4
Minneapolis	5.0	10.1	5.5
Nashville	6.3	7.1	7.9
New Orleans	9.3	19.7	10.5
New York City	33.5	62.6	36.4
Norfolk	4.9	8.1	3.7
Oakland	2.4	2.4	1.1
Oklahoma City	NA	NA	NA
Omaha	13.8	23.1	15.4
Philadelphia	14.3	30.5	12.0
Phoenix[2]	1.1	23.3	3.5
Pittsburgh	2.3	4.9	2.4
Portland	7.6	14.5	11.8
Rochester	1.5	1.8	1.2
St. Louis	11.4	20.1	5.7
St. Paul	4.8	7.6	4.5
Sacramento	NA	NA	NA
San Diego	1.9	3.6	2.6
San Francisco	1.4	2.4	1.4
Seattle	6.1	11.2	5.3
Toledo	3.0	4.5	2.4
Tucson	9.6	10.6	9.9
Tulsa	5.1	9.0	7.3
Washington, D.C.	100.0	100.0	100.0
Average	**17.7%**	**30.4%**	**16.3%**

[1]1980 Census Data
[2]Includes percentage of school-age children in poverty for the entire city; other statistics are for the Phoenix Union High School District

The question may be asked, however, by those outside the cities: "Why should I care?" The reasons are uncomplicated. First, America's economic and global primacy depends on the productivity of the children now being educated in our city schools, the next generation of workers. Consider this fact: if the graduation rate for urban schools equaled the national average, the nation's major city schools would have graduated 325,520 students in 1988 instead of 239,317. At the current 28% tax rate, the federal tax on the additional lifetime earnings of those extra 86,203 individuals -- had they stayed in school -- is large enough to double the present Congressional appropriation for elementary and secondary education, increase federal AIDS research five-fold, or boost drug prevention efforts by a factor of ten -- efforts that benefit the whole nation, not just the cities. Second, unless action is taken immediately, the problems facing the big city schools will become prevalent in all the nation's schools. Finally, the country has a moral imperative, grounded in the Constitution, to strive for individual justice, equality and excellence for all its citizens. Education is the only public strategy designed to endow those rights on all our young people.

In short, our city schools are the fundamental test of our national vision -- a commitment to social democracy for all. This is a vision that has been much blurred of recent. The nation's inattention to the needs and promise of urban youth is a spiritual failure of the first magnitude and a catastrophic mistake that saps our national strength.

To address this challenge, the nation's city schools mobilized -- with the blessing of the White House -- to formulate the National Urban Education Goals. Over seventy national

education, civil rights, child advocacy, city and state organizations were involved in the process and were asked to pledge a united ten year effort in pursuit of the goals. These goals, derived from the national ones set in Charlottesville, reflected the unique needs of those students who are furthest away from meeting them -- poor urban and rural students. The goals are as follows:

National Urban Education Goals

1. By the year 2000, schools and communities will demonstrate high expectations for all learners so that urban students will attain a level of achievement that will allow them to compete successfully with students nationally and internationally.

2. By the year 2000, all urban school children will start school ready to learn.

3. By the year 2000, urban schools will increase their graduation rates so they are at least comparable to the national average.

4. By the year 2000, urban school graduates will be fully prepared to enter and successfully complete higher education, experience successful employment, and exercise their responsibilities as citizens.

5. By the year 2000, urban schools will be adequately staffed with qualified teachers who are culturally and racially sensitive and who reflect the racial characteristics of their students.

6. By the year 2000, urban schools will be free of drugs and alcohol, students will be well-nourished and healthy, and schools will be well-maintained and safe.

Each goal was accompanied by detailed objectives and promising, well-tested strategies for reaching those goals -- strategies based on research and practical experience in urban settings, strategies that were used along with those devised by the Quality Education for Minorities Network to build the "USA" bill. In January, 1992, we will be releasing a report on the status of urban schools on the goals and how we compare with the nation.

We have committed ourselves, as urban school leaders, to a set of demanding national goals by the year 2000; we have said how we are going to get there; we have said how we will measure our progress; and we have involved an unprecedented range of groups -- acknowledging that we can not get there alone.

And we cannot. The challenges faced by urban schools are too entrenched, complex, entangled, and costly for a single agency or institution to solve. We need the assistance and collaboration of everyone who can help, including the federal government.

We are, then, urging this Committee, this Congress, this Administration, to join us in devising a "Marshall Plan" for urban and rural schools, and using that plan as the foundation for broader federal support of the nation's schools. Mr. Chairman, we recommend that the foundation for such a plan be the "Urban Schools of America (USA)" Act, a bill that serves as the logical next step to H.R.3320 and provides a transition to a much larger general aid package that we believe is necessary if the federal government is to be an equal partner in our schools' drive to meet the goals. Important features of the "USA" bill include:

- **A comprehensive and systemic local program based on achieving the national goals rather than on specific categories of children;**
- **Flexibility to design local programs that could best meet the national goals;**
- **An unprecedented accountability provision that would cut off "USA" funds if a school did not make progress toward the goals according to pre-set criteria;**
- **Incentive grants to schools that make unusually high progress toward the goals, remove barriers to student achievement, and reform for the future;**

- **Sufficient size and scale to make a real difference;**
- **The possibility of waiving certain regulations that might impede student achievement;**
- **Collaboration with a wide variety of community-based, parent and private-sector organizations;**
- **Resources to repair and renovate our dilapidated school buildings; and**
- **Funds for evaluating and assessing progress on the goals.**

Why this bill and why now?

First, the legislation is designed to dovetail with one of the nation's most important new educational demands -- the need to move critical **decisions** down to those closest to the children. While the Administration and the states are receiving most of the media attention, it is the cities which are now pioneering ways to do just this. Chicago has moved toward fully decentralized, parent/community run schools. New York is deeply engaged in school-based management/shared decision making, as Miami has been for over a decade. And Philadelphia is engaged in an effort of restructuring schools' strategies of governance, instructional programs, assessment, and relations with local communities, parents, employers and universities. Other reform and restructuring efforts can be found in Toledo, Pittsburgh, San Diego, Rochester, Memphis, Seattle and many other cities. The "USA" bill spurs these initiatives, and helps meet the demand to restructure by providing the greatest flexibility to get the job done.

Second, the legislation is designed to address the growing insistence of accountability for **results**. The nation's parents, taxpayers, and business community are correct in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

demanding a return on their investment. The "USA" bill speaks to this demand by stating that the funds should be cut off if progress is not evident. No other piece of federal legislation has gone as far as this.

Third, the "USA" bill adopts one of the good ideas from President Bush's education package by **rewarding** success. If a low-achieving school makes unusual progress towards the goals, then it is given extra resources. If a low-achieving school system removes barriers to children's learning, then it is rewarded. If a poor school system restructures itself to meet the needs of the children more effectively, it is provided additional funds.

Fourth, the bill is **large** enough and **targeted** enough to make a difference. It sends money only to the nation's hardest pressed inner city school systems, and within those systems, to the lowest achieving and poorest schools to conduct school-wide improvement activities. Furthermore, it helps fill the enormous gap between what the states are able to fund and what the inner city schools lack. It is, therefore, cost-efficient at a time when the federal government is concerned about its deficit but preserves the historic federal role of serving those most in need.

Finally, the "USA" bill offers **comprehensive** and **fundamental** assistance. It seeks to involve the entire urban community in assisting its children, including parents, colleges and universities, businesses, labor, government, community-based groups and other agencies. It does so in a way that significantly broadens the current federal strategy of targeting aid

based solely on the demographic characteristics of students. The "USA" bill builds on that approach by tying all these efforts and their supporters together in a grand plan for our schools' improvement. Let us work together to make sure that this bill lives up to its claims.

In general, urban schools have demonstrated that additional investment is worth the cost. Each of the major cities can point to programs that are making a real difference in the lives of young people. And national studies, such as those conducted by the National Assessment on Educational Progress (NAEP), show that academic achievement is greatest among city and poor rural students who are receiving the benefits of newly targeted federal assistance.

Mr. Chairman, the urban schools of this nation ask you, the Congress, to join with us to renew our historic vows on behalf of the neediest amongst us, and move together to reinvest in the nation's children, my children, your children, our children.

This initiative reaffirms Emma Lazarus' welcome engraved at the base of the Statue of Liberty: "Give us your hungry, your tired, and your poor." It does not offer platitudes based on "choice" rhetoric or fall into the 1980's selfish indifference to the homeless, the poor, or the oppressed.

If we can bail out our savings and loans, we can lift up our children. If we can build more prisons, we can keep our schools from looking like them. If we can fashion the

50-273 0 - 92 - 3

weapons of war, we can mastermind the tools for learning.

We are asking, then, through the "USA" bill, for a broadened strategy and an enhanced investment in improving schools where improvement is most necessary -- the inner cities. We are asking that Congress seize the initiative in moving us toward our national goals.

The "USA" bill urges that you build on the current federal strategy, not through additional small competitive grant programs, but through comprehensive services. It discourages systems that are self-protective and encourages collaboration. It asks for money but demands results. And it does so through an image of educational democracy that is unprecedented.

We ask no less of you than we ask of ourselves, our teachers, our parents, and our students. Help us help the children who need us most desperately, and who want, most painfully, to be part of the American dream, but who believe that it is well beyond their reach.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes our testimony. We would be happy to answer questions. Thank you.

ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING THE "USA" BILLS

1. American Association of Educational Service Agencies
2. American Association of School Administrators (AASA)
3. American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU)
4. American Association of University Women
5. American Educational Research Association (AERA)
6. American Federation of Teachers (AFT)
7. American School Food Service Association
8. American Youth Work Center
9. ASPIRA Association, Inc.
10. Association of School/Business Partnership Directors
11. Center for Women's Policy Studies
12. Child Welfare League
13. College Board
14. Council for Basic Education
15. Council for Educational Development and Research (CEDAR)
16. Council for Exceptional Children (CEC)
17. Council of Educational Facility Planners International
18. Council of Large Public Housing Authorities
19. Council of the Great City Schools (CGCS)
20. Cuban American National Council, Inc.
21. Food Research Action Committee (FRAC)
22. Girl Scouts of the United States of America
23. Home and School Institute
24. Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL)
25. International Reading Association
26. League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC)
27. Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF)*
28. National Alliance of Black School Educators
29. National Assembly of Voluntary Health and Social Welfare Organizations
30. National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP)
31. National Association of School Psychologists
32. National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP)
33. National Association of Social Workers
34. National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE)
35. National Association of State Coordinators for the Education of Homeless Children and Youth
36. National Association of Title I/Chapter 1 Parents
37. National Collaboration for Youth
38. National Committee for Citizens in Education
39. National Council for the Social Studies
40. National Council of Educational Opportunity Associations
41. National Council of Teachers of English
42. National Dropout Prevention Center
43. National Education Association (NEA)

44. National Federation of State High School Associations
45. National Institute for Women of Color
46. National League of Cities (NLC)
47. National Parent/Teachers Association (PTA)
48. National School Boards Association (NSBA)*
49. National School Public Relations Association (NSPRA)
50. National School Safety Center
51. National Urban League, Inc.
52. Quality Education for Minorities Network (Q.E.M.)
53. U.S. Conference of Mayors
54. Work, Achievement, Values and Education, Inc. (WAVE) (formerly 7,001, Inc.)
55. Youth Build, USA
56. Youth Service America

*Supports S.1135 only

HOUSE CO-SPONSORS OF THE "USA" BILL (H.R.1669)

Abercrombie, Neil (D-HI)
Ackerman, Gary (D-NY)
Anderson, Glenn (D-CA)
AuCoin, Les (D-OR)
Berman, Howard (D-CA)
Bonior, Dave (D-MI)
Borski, Robert (D-PA)
Campbell, Ben (D-CO)
Clay, William (D-MO)
Coleman, Ron (D-TX)
Collins, Cardiss (D-IL)
Conyers, John (D-MI)
Coyne, William (D-PA)
DeLauro, Rosa (D-CT)
Dellums, Ron (D-CA)
Dicks, Norm (D-SC)
Dixon, Julian (D-CA)
Dymally, Merv (D-CA)
Eckart, Dennis (D-OH)
Edwards, Don (D-CA)
English, Glenn (D-OK)
Fascell, Dante (D-FL)
Flake, Floyd (D-NY)
Foglietta, Thomas (D-PA)
Ford, Harold (D-TN)
Frank, Barney (D-MA)
Frost, Martin (D-TX)
Fuster, Jaime (D-PR)
Gray, William(D-PA)
Hayes, Charles(D-IL)
Hertel, Dennis (D-MI)
Hoagland, Peter (D-NE)
Holmes-Norton, Eleanor (D-DC)
Jefferson, William* (D-LA)
Jones, Ben (D-GA)
Kaptur, Marcy (D-OH)
Kennelly, Barbara (D-CT)
Kopetski, Mike (D-OR)
LaFalce, John (D-NY)
Laughlin, Greg (D-TX)
Lehman, William (D-CA)
Lewis, John (D-GA)
Lipinski, William (D-IL)
Lloyd, Marilyn (D-TN)
Manton, Tom (D-NY)
Martinez, Matthew (D-CA)
Matsui, Robert (D-CA)
McDermott, Jim (D-WA)
Mfumi, Kweisi (D-MD)
Mineta, Norm (D-CA)
Moody, Jim (D-WI)
Nowak, Henry (D-NY)
Oberstar, Jim (D-MN)
Owens, Major (D-NY)
Payne, Donald (D-NJ)
Pelosi, Nancy (D-CA)
Perkins, Chris (D-KY)
Pickett, Owen (D-VA)
Rangel, Charles (D-NY)
Roe, Robert (D-NJ)
Romano, Mazzoli (D-KY)
Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana (R-FL)
Rose-Collins, Barbara (D-MI)
Roybal, Ed (D-CA)
Russo, Marty (D-IL)
Sanders, Bernie (I-VT)
Savage, Gus (D-IL)
Sawyer, Thomas (D-OH)
Scheuer, James (D-NY)
Schroeder, Patricia (D-CO)
Schumer, Charles (D-NY)
Serrano, Jose (D-NY)
Slaughter, Louise (D-NY)
Smith, Larry (D-FL)
Solarz, Steve (D-NY)
Stokes, Louis (D-OH)
Studds, Gerry (D-MA)
Towns, Edolphus (D-NY)
Washington, Craig (D-TX)
Waters, Maxine (D-CA)
Weiss, Ted (D-NY)
Wheat, Alan (D-MO)
Wolpe, Howard (D-MI)
Wyden, Ron (D-OR)
Yates, Sid (D-IL)
Zelif, Bill (R-NH)

*Principle Sponsor

50-273 0 - 92 - 4

ESTIMATED "USA" GRANTS TO ELIGIBLE CITIES*

STATE/City	School District	Meeting Goals Title I	Repairing Schools Title II	Evaluating Results Title III	Total
ALASKA					
Anchorage	Anchorage S.D.	$7,552,500	$7,870,500	$424,000	$15,847,000
ALABAMA					
Birmingham	Birmingham S.D.	8,122,500	8,464,800	456,000	17,043,300
Mobile	Mobile County S.D.	12,825,000	13,365,000	720,000	26,910,000
Huntsville	Huntsville City S.D.	4,702,500	4,900,500	264,000	9,867,000
ARIZONA					
Mesa	Mesa Unified S.D.	11,542,500	12,028,500	648,000	24,219,000
Tucson	Tucson Unified #1	10,687,500	11,137,500	600,000	22,425,000
Phoenix	Phoenix H.S. #210	3,562,500	3,712,500	200,000	7,475,000
	Washington S.D. #6	4,132,500	4,306,500	232,000	8,671,000
	Scottsdale #48	3,705,000	3,861,000	208,000	7,774,000
	Deer Valley #97	2,850,000	2,970,000	160,000	5,980,000
	Cartwright S.D. #83	2,565,000	2,673,000	144,000	5,382,000
	Paradise Valley	4,845,000	5,049,000	272,000	10,166,000
ARKANSAS					
Little Rock	Little Rock S.D.	5,130,000	5,346,000	288,000	10,764,000
CALIFORNIA					
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	112,290,000	117,018,000	6,304,000	235,612,000
Long Beach	Long Beach Unified	12,682,500	13,216,500	712,000	26,611,000
Fresno	Fresno Unified	12,255,000	12,771,000	688,000	25,714,000
San Francisco	San Francisco Unified	11,827,500	12,325,500	664,000	24,817,000
San Diego	San Diego Unified	22,230,500	23,166,000	1,248,000	46,644,500
San Jose	San Jose Unified	5,557,500	5,791,500	312,000	11,661,000
Fremont	Fremont Unified	4,987,500	5,197,500	280,000	10,465,000
Oakland	Oakland Unified	9,690,000	10,098,000	544,000	20,332,000
Santa Ana	Santa Ana Unified	7,552,500	7,870,500	424,000	15,847,000
Riverside	Riverside Unified	5,415,000	5,643,000	304,000	11,362,000
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	8,835,000	9,207,000	496,000	18,538,000
COLORADO					
Denver	Denver County S.D.	11,115,000	11,583,000	624,000	23,322,000
Colorado Springs	Colorado Springs #11	5,700,000	5,940,000	320,000	11,960,000
Aurora	Adams – Aropahoe	4,845,000	5,049,000	272,000	10,166,000
CONNECTICUT					
Hartford	Hartford S.D.	4,560,000	4,752,000	256,000	9,568,000
D.C.					
Washington	D.C. Public Schools	16,102,500	16,780,500	904,000	33,787,000
DELEWARE					
Wilmington	Red Clay Consolidated	2,707,500	2,821,500	152,000	5,681,000

FLORIDA					
Miami	Dade County S.D.	50,730,000	52,866,000	2,848,000	106,444,000
Jacksonville	Duval County S.D.	19,950,000	20,790,000	1,120,000	41,860,000
Tampa	Hillsborough County S.D.	22,515,000	23,463,000	1,264,000	47,242,000
GEORGIA					
Atlanta	Atlanta P.S.	11,372,500	11,880,000	640,000	23,892,500
Columbus	Muscogue County S.D.	5,557,500	5,791,500	312,000	11,661,000
HAWAII					
Honolulu	Hawaii State Schools	31,635,000	32,967,000	1,776,000	66,378,000
IDAHO					
Boise	Boise City ISD #1	4,275,000	4,455,000	240,000	8,970,000
ILLINOIS					
Chicago	City of Chicago S.D. #29	74,670,000	77,814,000	4,192,000	156,676,000
INDIANA					
Indianapolis	Indianapolis P.S.	9,547,500	9,949,500	536,000	20,033,000
IOWA					
Des Moines	Des Moines Ind. Comm. Sch	5,985,000	6,237,000	336,000	12,558,000
KANSAS					
Wichita	Wichita P.S.	8,977,500	9,355,500	504,000	18,837,000
KENTUCKY					
Louisville	Jefferson County P.S.	17,527,500	18,265,500	984,000	36,777,000
Lexington	Fayette County P.S.	5,985,000	6,237,000	336,000	12,558,000
LOUISIANA					
New Orleans	Orleans Parish S.B.	15,960,000	16,632,000	896,000	33,488,000
Baton Rouge	E. Baton Rouge Parish S.B.	10,972,500	11,434,500	616,000	23,023,000
MARYLAND					
Baltimore	Baltimore City P.S.	20,377,500	21,235,500	1,144,000	42,757,000
MASSACHUSSETTS					
Boston	Boston S.D.	11,257,500	11,731,500	632,000	23,621,000
MAINE					
Portland	Portland P.S.	1,425,000	1,485,000	80,000	2,990,000
MICHIGAN					
Detroit	Detroit City S.D.	32,917,500	34,303,500	1,848,000	69,069,000
Flint	Flint City S.D.	5,272,500	5,494,500	296,000	11,063,000
Grand Rapids	Grand Rapids City S.D.	4,702,500	4,900,500	264,000	9,867,000
MINNESOTA					
Minneapolis	Minneapolis Special S.D.	7,552,500	7,870,500	424,000	15,847,000
St. Paul	St. Paul S.D.	6,270,000	6,534,000	352,000	13,156,000
MISSISSIPPI					
Jackson	Jackson Public S.D.	6,270,000	6,534,000	352,000	13,156,000

MISSOURI					
St. Louis	St. Louis City S.D.	8,692,500	9,058,500	488,000	18,239,000
Kansas City	Kansas City S.D. #33	6,697,500	6,979,500	376,000	14,053,000
MONTANA					
Billings	Billings Public Schools	2,850,000	2,970,000	160,000	5,980,000
NEBRASKA					
Omaha	Omaha P.S.	7,837,500	8,167,500	440,000	16,445,000
Lincoln	Lincoln P.S.	4,987,500	5,197,500	280,000	10,465,000
NEVADA					
Las Vegas	Clark County S.D.	19,950,000	20,790,000	1,120,000	41,860,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE					
Manchester	Manchester S.D.	2,707,500	2,821,500	152,000	5,681,000
NEW JERSEY					
Newark	Newark S.D.	9,405,000	9,801,000	528,000	19,734,000
Jersey City	Jersey City S.D.	5,272,500	5,494,500	296,000	11,063,000
NEW MEXICO					
Albuquerque	Albuquerque S.D.	16,102,500	16,780,500	904,000	33,787,000
NEW YORK					
New York	New York City P.S.	177,270,000	184,734,000	9,952,000	371,956,000
Buffalo	Buffalo City P.S.	8,692,500	9,058,500	488,000	18,239,000
Rochester	Rochester City P.S.	5,985,000	6,237,000	336,000	12,558,000
NORTH CAROLINA					
Charlotte	Mecklenburg County S.D.	14,250,000	14,850,000	800,000	29,900,000
NORTH DAKOTA					
Bismarck	Bismarck P.S.	1,995,000	2,079,000	112,000	4,186,000
OHIO					
Akron	Akron City S.D.	6,412,500	6,682,500	360,000	13,455,000
Cincinnati	Cincinnati City S.D.	9,837,500	10,246,500	552,000	20,631,000
Cleveland	Cleveland City S.D.	13,680,000	14,256,000	768,000	28,704,000
Columbus	Columbus City S.D.	12,397,500	12,919,500	696,000	26,013,000
Dayton	Dayton City S.D.	5,415,000	5,643,000	304,000	11,362,000
Toledo	Toledo City S.D.	7,980,000	8,316,000	448,000	16,744,000
OKLAHOMA					
Tulsa	Tulsa City S.D.	7,695,000	8,019,000	432,000	16,146,000
Oklahoma City	Oklahoma City S.D.	7,267,500	7,573,500	408,000	15,249,000
OREGON					
Portland	Portland S.D. #1	10,117,500	10,543,500	568,000	21,229,000
PENNSYLVANIA					
Philadelphia	Philadelphia City S.D.	36,195,000	37,719,000	2,032,000	75,946,000
Pittsburgh	Pittsburgh S.D.	7,552,500	7,870,500	424,000	15,847,000
RHODE ISLAND					
Providence	Providence S.D.	3,705,000	3,861,000	208,000	7,774,000

SOUTH CAROLINA					
Columbia	Richmond S.D. #2	2,280,000	2,376,000	128,000	4,784,000
SOUTH DAKOTA					
Sioux Falls	Sioux Falls S.D. 49-5	2,850,000	2,970,000	160,000	5,980,000
TENNESSEE					
Memphis	Memphis City S.D.	19,950,000	20,790,000	1,120,000	41,860,000
Nashville	Davidson County S.D.	12,825,000	13,365,000	720,000	26,910,000
TEXAS					
Austin	Autin I.S.D.	11,827,500	12,325,500	664,000	24,817,000
Corpus Christi	Corpus Christi I.S.D.	7,837,500	8,167,500	440,000	16,445,000
Dallas	Dallas I.S.D.	24,795,000	25,839,000	1,392,000	52,026,000
El Paso	El Paso I.S.D.	11,970,000	12,474,000	672,000	25,116,000
Ft. Worth	Ft. Worth I.S.D.	12,825,000	13,365,000	720,000	26,910,000
Houston	Houston I.S.D.	36,052,500	37,570,500	2,024,000	75,647,000
	Aldice I.S.D.	7,125,000	7,425,000	400,000	14,950,000
	Cypress-Fairbanks I.S.D.	6,840,000	7,128,000	384,000	14,352,000
San Antonio	San Antonio I.S.D.	11,685,000	12,177,000	656,000	24,518,000
	North East I.S.D.	7,552,500	7,870,500	424,000	15,847,000
	North Side I.S.D.	9,120,000	9,504,000	512,000	19,136,000
UTAH					
Salt Lake City	Salt Lake City S.D.	4,702,500	4,900,500	264,000	9,867,000
VIRGINIA					
Norfolk	Norfolk City P.S.	6,982,500	7,276,500	392,000	14,651,000
Richmond	Richmond City P.S.	5,130,000	5,346,000	288,000	10,764,000
Virginia Beach	Virginia Beach P.S.	12,682,500	13,216,500	712,000	26,611,000
VERMONT					
Burlington	Burlington P.S.	712,500	742,500	40,000	1,495,000
WASHINGTON					
Seattle	Seattle S.D.	8,122,500	8,464,500	456,000	17,043,000
Tacoma	Tacoma S.D.	5,557,500	5,791,500	312,000	11,661,000
Spokane	Spokane S.D.	5,272,500	5,494,500	296,000	11,063,000
WEST VIRGINIA					
Charlston	Kanawha County S.D.	6,840,600	7,128,000	384,000	14,352,000
WISCONSIN					
Milwaukee	Milwaukee S.D.	17,385,000	18,117,000	976,000	36,478,000
WYOMING					
Casper	Natrona County S.D. #1	2,422,500	2,524,500	136,000	5,083,000
	TOTAL	$1,414,570,500	$1,474,159,800	$79,416,000	$2,968,146,300

*Estimates based on per student allocations. Numbers and school systems are preliminary and are subject to change.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you very much, Dr. Garcia. I will start with a couple of questions first on urban schools, then we will go to rural schools.

One of the comments that was made, I think, Dale mentioned it, was about sitting around a home in a rural area saying there is nothing to do here. You know in the 1920's, and 1930's, and 1940's that was said, and people came to Flint, Michigan or Detroit, to Dale Kildee's district, or Bill Ford's district.

I think probably the largest single group in my district are southerners, and they came up. And now, strangely, parents are saying to their kids, "There is nothing for you to do here in the urban areas too."

So maybe the circuit has closed, and there are some similarities that there are some unique problems in the urban areas, some unique problems in the rural areas, but some problems too that are common, and we have to address those.

And I do know that many of the people from Kentucky and West Virginia are kind of looking back "home" again, because there is nothing to do in the cities.

As our Nation experiences greater social and economic problems—and we certainly are experiencing those right now—very often rural America feels those first, and inner city urban America feels those first. In the urban areas these conditions changed the expectations of what services schools are expected to provide in the urban areas. Could you, both of you, just tell us how your role and the role of the schools have changed in the urban areas?

Mr. PROPHET. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me give you an example of a real live development that has occurred in one city in Portland, but it has occurred in many places. But we are a microcosm, and since I am here I can give this example.

We have in Portland a school system that is demographically diverse in terms of having areas that are very highly affluent, areas that are middle class, and areas that are absolutely terribly at the lowest end of the socioeconomic spectrum.

In those areas, in the latter category, where we may have clients who have their children, young women who become pregnant, these young women when they become pregnant sometimes have diseases. These young women sometimes when they become pregnant and, of course, can in fact bear drug babies.

We have in Portland an increasing number of children who were born as drug babies. If you talk with the people at the Doernbecher Hospital in Portland, and they ask you how much does it cost 1 year to have a drug baby in residence, this director will tell you anywhere from $75,000 to $100,000 a year. He will tell you further, therefore there is no economic answer when there are thousands and thousands such babies being born.

Now, to deal directly with your question on this one point. The schools are expected to prevent that condition from developing. We are expected to, number one, hopefully to prevent this young woman from having the baby. Number two, if she has the baby in some way, we are expected to know how to educate this child. We are expected to know how to diagnose, how to find out what the difficulties are in educating this child.

And the expectations of the community is no less for the drug baby than for the other baby, because this is something which, as you look at all the literature and all the rhetoric about American education, its accomplishments and/or its failure, this is an area which has been far overlooked.

By the same token, let's assume that this young woman has her baby, and she drops out of school. The expectation is that we do not permit her to drop out of school. But let's assume we get her back in school, that you helped us do that.

You have passed and we have in effect throughout America now something called The Family Support Act, which says that if this young woman comes—she is on welfare, she is getting $408 a month on welfare, you have said to her the last year and a half or so that, "Either, young woman, you go back to school or you will lose your $408." This young woman does come back to school, she gets her $408.

But when she gets her $408 to come back to school, suddenly no one is there to take care of her child. We are expected as a school system to take care of her child. $408 was enough to take care of her and her child when she could take care of her child, but with her not being able to take care of her child that means that you cannot do that with $408.

And so I could follow, Mr. Chairman, the progress of this person all the way through our school system. I could follow whether it is her or her family, the various services that they get, and to the extent that the social fabric of our political and other governmental systems become dysfunctional.

It is the school that is looked upon as being a family support center to do all of these things. So the expectations is whatever goes wrong, the schools will fix it. And I have given you one profile of one type student. I have 50 profiles of that kind, but you don't have time to hear all the other profiles, of the immigrant student and all the other kinds. You know, the student who has been a gang member who has come from Los Angeles, up I-5, you know. There are many, many, many profiles.

But whatever it is, Mr. Chairman, the schools are expected to fix it, but America doesn't even think about the fact that the schools are asked to fix it. They are only looking at what are schools doing in terms of student achievement. But those are—that is one example, sir.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you.

Dr. Garcia.

Dr. GARCIA. Well you spoke earlier about your perception of driving through cities and seeing permanent underclass developing in the cities. Dr. Prophet spoke about one characteristic of that.

The issue on dropout prevention and dropout consideration, the statistics nationally are that large percentages of our African American students, a large percentages of our Hispanic students, Native American students are dropping in disproportionate numbers through others in large cities.

How one addresses that requires a tremendous amount of individual attention, small alternative kinds of programs for many of these youngsters, and a lot of intervention with a lot of community organizations.

One, in particular, institution that Dr. Prophet referred to, but not defined, is the changing nature of the family. Most kids who are at risk come from families that are very, very dysfunctional. How does one in an urban school environment intervene and identify ways of helping parents help their children?

All of these require very creative new strategies and approaches, not only by the school administration but by the teachers, by the business leadership, and by the community organizations within that city. So the characteristics of education today have changed dramatically from the period that you referred to in your opening question.

Chairman KILDEE. One follow-up question and I will defer to Mr. Goodling, then I want to get to some rural questions then also.

In looking around Flint, Michigan, I see young ladies giving birth to children, and wondering whether—well questioning, with good reason, whether they really have parenting skills and what is the role of the school in helping those young ladies develop parenting skills?

Mr. PROPHET. Okay, sir. Excellent question, and we happen to have, along with the assistance of Congressman Wyden from Oregon, implemented a program in Portland in which is incorporated the parenting skills component.

I was mentioning earlier about the Family Support Act, and that these young women are coming back to school. We, in fact, have incorporated into that particular course parenting skills. It is a program that is done in concert with the Children Services Division of our State, with our county, with our city, with our private industry accounts, and with the school system, as well as with the Human Resources Development Institute.

In your city, sir, I have had the pleasure over the course of the last 9 months, since you were talking about that, of working with your superintendent, Nat Bertley. You may know Judy Lanier, who is the Dean of the College of Education at Michigan State University, and she in working with the Governor and others are hopefully over the period of time, the next 3 or 4 years, going to work in 13 or 14 cities and establish, in addition to professional development schools in places such as Flint where university teachers and experts, and so forth, are working with teachers, also this whole new institutional configuration.

We now have a middle school in Flint. We have one in Muskegon Heights, and in Lansing. And that whole milieu of the teaching of social support services, parenting, and things that go beyond the normal educationa! expectations are now there being very effectively, generically incorporated into a new mosaic of an educational delivery system. Not only just for the child but for the family as well.

We, in fact, have parenting classes in community schools in many of our cities. And I am sure that most of the cities in America—in fact Flint is the founder, is the father, so to speak, of community school concept, but we are involving parents who either are in school or parents who have kids in school, in parenting. And that, we feel, is one of our new charges and one of our new very valued obligations. Thank you.

Mr. GARCIA. I might just add, Mr. Chairman, that prior to coming to Tucson, I was Superintendent of the Kansas City, Missouri Public Schools. And Missouri has a tremendous program called Parents as Partners.

In Kansas City, we were working with parents of 3 and 4 year old children on a weekly basis, on helping them develop parenting skills in general, and parenting skills and particulars that related to working with their kids in schools.

And that was an extremely successful program, and I speak very, very highly of the Missouri program for that.

Chairman KILDEE. I think it is important that we recognize too that parenting skills are more than a one gender skill.

Mr. PROPHET. The young men are—I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. But the young men are permitted to attend on a voluntary, I quote, voluntary basis. Thank you, sir.

Chairman KILDEE. Very good. Mr. Goodling.

Mr. GOODLING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I want to welcome the students. I was an educator for 23 years, and I always say since I left that I miss all of the students, most of my employees, and some of the parents.

[Laughter.]

Mr. GOODLING. I would encourage the panel not to encourage us just to send more money. I can take Superintendent Prophet back 10 years beyond. He got into the 1970's and the 1980's, I, the 1960's and the 1970's. I was the recipient of all those misguided programs from the Federal level in the 1960's, with lots of money. And I can take you out to schools, if they haven't thrown them away by this time, and show you more TV sets, more overhead projectors, more film strips, more books, et cetera, collecting dust.

The money was there, we were supposed to spend it. No comprehensive plan, nothing that brought about systemic change. And I haven't seen anything up until the last couple of years bring about any systemic change on the local level, on the State level, or on the Federal level.

It would be my hope that once and for all we are beginning to see a movement that will provide—and I think it was Superintendent Garcia used the word comprehensive—a comprehensive approach to making changes that are going to make a difference.

When I came to Congress, I think our contribution was about $5 billion, now it is $32 billion, and it is another $2 billion for Head Start. But we are in the business down here, and it is getting worse because now that education is sexy, not only everybody on the committee has a program that they want to push, but I guarantee every committee has a program.

I was just a conferee on the Intelligence Authorization bill. I don't know why I even went. They had it cut and dried, sealed and delivered. They are now in the business of education, and they suggested that maybe they could get some money from our committee. I said, "Well you could get it all if you would do all the work through our committee and not 20 other committees."

We don't know what the left hand does around here, and we duplicate, and it is a tragedy. But it is getting worse, unfortunately, rather than better. So I guess what I am saying is that come and keep preaching the comprehensive program, come and keep

preaching something that is going to bring about systemic change. Don't just say, "Send us more money." Because we have done a lot of that.

The Chairman and I served on the Budget Committee, and I think we got more than our share every time. The budget committee wrapped up the proceedings, got blessed, cussed, and everything else because we ran away with a lion's share.

But I don't know if we have made a difference just by pouring in more money. So I hope. You know, I was just looking at all the different bills that have been introduced, and we will soon have enough councils, and we will soon have enough assistant superintendents, et cetera, et cetera, we won't get any money out to the people like you, who are going to do something with it, because we will have spent it all in the bureaucratic process.

So, I hope we can get some comprehensive program that will bring about systemic change and that we will get the most bang for the few bucks that we can scrape up. But, as I said, we have been fairly lucky, I think, in getting the amount that we have been able to get.

To the superintendents, I sympathize. I don't know whether I could cut the mustard if I went back to that at the present time. Until we are finished playing a bank, a cooperative is now a bank thing, I may have to go back into the private sector somewhere. But maybe I will go back to being a—to the impossible job today, and that would be the high school principal. I tried that for 10 years too.

But again, I appreciate your coming. I hope that we can not talk about rural and not talk about urban, and can talk about a comprehensive program that will bring about systemic change.

The rural poor are probably the poorest in the country because, unfortunately, there are no services out there even if they could get to them in many instances. And so, hopefully, we can look equally.

When this gentleman's father was the Chairman of the committee, I'll guarantee you every formula was geared in that direction. I can guarantee when Chairman Hawkins was the Chairman, every formula was geared to the two gentlemen sitting behind you. So now we will try to come up with one that won't go to Michigan, but will go as a matter of fact to a comprehensive program that will bring about change, and all will be treated equally. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. Goodling. The Chairman of the subcommittee has in his district an urban area, Rust Belt America, wheat farmers, beef farmers, hog farmers. I have kind of a cross section, a microcosm of America. The bulk of my people are urban, but I do have the advantage of recognizing we have a rural America too.

Mr. GOODLING. I forgot both the Chairman of the full committee and the Chairman of the subcommittee are from Michigan.

[Laughter.]

I probably should have chosen some other State.

Chairman KILDEE. The President of the NEA is from Michigan too.

Mr. GOODLING. He has never even asked for an appointment with me, so apparently Pennsylvania doesn't count.

Chairman KILDEE. We will arrange that appointment. Now it is my pleasure to call upon the chief sponsor of the Rural Schools of America Act of 1991, my good friend, Chris Perkins.

Mr. PERKINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I very much appreciate you holding this hearing today, and I would like to thank you for trying to continue in this endeavor to look at some of the problems and solutions that we have in education in America today.

I would like to thank all the panelist for giving us their views on the subjects of that. I would like to especially welcome the Deputy Superintendent of the Schools in Kentucky, Lois Adams-Rodgers. It is good to have you with us today.

Ms. ADAMS-RODGERS. Thank you. It is nice to be here.

Mr. PERKINS. Of course, it is very good to look at some of the things that are going on in Kentucky. With the reform effort you were describing that is occurring in Kentucky today, how long do you think it is going to be before you see some sort of measurable results, and how are you going to measure those results?

Ms. ADAMS-RODGERS. Thank you. That is an excellent question, and one that perhaps is a unique question to ask when you are thinking about a State legislature that meets every 2 years, and a Governor that changes every 4 years.

Typically, the pendulum has swung from one side to the other and we haven't ever had a piece of legislation that had time lines that were realistic. The actual time lines in the Reform Act for the various component parts being implemented have about a 6 year span, which is the first unique portion.

The systemic nature of change generally is going to take a while for us to see change. I talked about the preschool program being implemented, and 18,000 students in that preschool program who are at-risk, who typically have not been served before.

As those children move through their K-12 program, we will see changes. As the primary school is implemented we will see changes. On the other hand, we are already implementing this spring——

Mr. PERKINS. Just one question there about those 18,000, briefly.

Ms. ADAMS-RODGERS. Sure.

Mr. PERKINS. Are there any plans to go after not just those eligible under the school lunch formula, but those who have problems, such as learning disabilities, or anything along those lines?

Ms. ADAMS-RODGERS. Right. The issue that was used, or the formula that was used did focus on those children eligible for free lunch. There has been, from my understanding just this week, a pre-filed bill with this session of the General Assembly that will look at other 4 year old students. School districts were given flexibility, if they had the space and the resources under this act to serve more than just those at-risk students.

And some districts were able to do that. Some have contracted with current Head Start Programs, other private providers, to assure that programs are being provided for 4 year old eligible students. So I think yes, we will see more students being involved. And, in fact, we may see all 4 year old students being eligible for the program at a future day.

The accountability piece that is in place with the Reform Act as well actually starts this spring, and school districts will have a testing program implemented at grades 4, 8 and 12, which will serve as a baseline statistic against which they are measured.

And there will be growth against themselves. They will be measured against themselves over the next 2 years. There will be testing each year in that mandatory testimony program, and then they must show a movement of growth for the students in that program. That is the mandatory assessment.

We are looking at implementing a continuous assessment program that is also performance based focus, which will include all students every year. So the accountability piece is going to be in place very soon.

The actual systemic change, again because change and systemic change takes time, is what we are attempting to help not only our school district folks realize, and our State Department folks realize, but also our supporters, the communities, the parents, the business community understand the time that is required in order to see the actual change.

We will see some things with the technology in place. We will also see the fact that the primary school will make a difference for students. So I see this light on. I have not seen this before. I think that means caution.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me ask one other question, if we are getting low on time here. And that is, considering the fact that we have—and this, I'm not just pressing you, Lois, but I'm asking generally in terms of the needs of rural education, what areas other than more money—which let's take as a given that we need more money. What specific areas do you think in terms of the targeting of resources are most in need of those additional funds presently?

And, I suppose, does Kentucky's needs with their new system differ from those that you would see in other rural systems around the Nation? Which perhaps Dale could talk about as well.

Mr. LESTINA. I don't think they differ a whole lot. They would have a little different shade to them. I think that in rural areas and urban areas—to pick up on Chairman Kildee's remark—the danger of a permanent underclass in both areas is critical.

And we can take a lesson, I think, from other countries who have gone through that. When that gets to be large enough and bad enough, they rise up the underclass and takes what it is that they are looking for. We don't need to go through that if we are smart and wise, and make our investment.

I think one of the big things that we could do that wouldn't cost a nickel, in the next big piece of legislation that moves forward, is to emphatically establish education as a Federal right for all American citizens.

See, that is not the case now. Along with that does go some assistance for dollars from the Federal level. Now the rural and urban bills are written so that they are very compatible, and can go together for the comprehensive piece that Mr. Goodling was just speaking about, in rolling them together.

But now for the rural school areas, the struggling, as you know, just to exist in the areas of population drop and in the areas of property value drop, and a dual problem of funding schools and

economic revitalization that is needed, just to get the critical mass that is necessary to be able to offer the kinds of course that are needed for today's jobs, that is something that I think is very common across rural America.

The area that I think in targeting an investment, one of the big areas is in the area of technology and distance learning. To be able to offer those kinds of courses that also transcends and has applications, in my judgement, in urban areas as well.

And what we really need to harken back to last week's testimony is physical advocates, in that we—when we say, you know, just don't ask for more money, we are not just asking for more money, as Mr. Goodling pointed out, just for a whim. This is a crying need for America's economic survival.

And right now the investment the Federal Government is putting in is just 6 percent. Well, I think that the dollar need is much higher than that from the Federal Government's commitment.

Ms. ADAMS-RODGERS. Is there time to address——

Chairman KILDEE. Yes. The red light only applies to the members, not to the witnesses.

Ms. ADAMS-RODGERS. Okay. Thank you. I think one of the things that we are really putting our hope in is the development of the Family Resource Youth Center concept. And our superintendent friends from the urban area I can very much appreciate. I have been a superintendent also, and actually come from an urban area.

But it is essential that we realize that we are addressing the issue, as Harold Hodgkinson referred to in a recent article in the capping of fixing the leaky roof. And we can't continue to band-aid just with programs that are isolated and fragmented, but we must address the whole issue of the family and the service needs of that family.

Through the development of these Family Resource Youth Service Centers, we believe that the interagency coordination is there, and it is not going to be an easy task. In fact, it is going to be a very difficult task, but we each, each agency has resources that affect those same children.

And until we can wipe the turf away and actually realize that we are attempting to serve the needs of the total child, not just the 8 a.m. to 3 p.m. time the school is responsible for, but rather a wrap around service for that child.

We have addressed in rural areas for many, many years the issue of eyeglasses and physicals and other health services and food for the family and assisting the family who has been burned out. We could go on and on. So our needs are very similar. The magnitude may be different, but the needs are similar.

So we believe that the issue of putting resources, and the forced coordination, I guess I would say, of the resources of all of the agencies to affect the child—because the child is the same child. And, in fact, these are the only children we are going to get. There is no—there are not—parents are not holding back their best kids. We have got all the kids that are going to come to us.

Chairman KILDEE. The Chair will call upon members in order of appearance. Mr. Jefferson.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to say, starting out, that the bringing together of the urban and rural wit-

nesses today, testimony today, and hearing today, to cover both areas exhibits a kind of genius, Mr. Chairman, because it recognizes that what we ought to be doing—and I wish Mr. Goodling was here, because I wanted to make some brief response to him—is to target the resources of the Federal Government in the areas where we have the largest problems and can do the most good.

And where we do not, there really is no hope that the national goals that are being set can be met by the country as a whole, unless we have them target on the areas where we have the greatest need. And we have those areas identified here.

Granted that there may be different approaches that are needed in the urban areas as opposed to the rural areas. But if we don't attack the problems of these two areas, there is no way there can be any success on the road toward reaching the national goals.

And so I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is important that we keep these two interest groups, if you will, married in this process, that we talk about them together. And, as I have told our colleague, Chris Perkins, and we have talked about it, not only do the two groups together represent, I think, a great constituency in the Congress and in the country, but also it is the only way we are going to really reach the national goals on any time table that makes any sense if we target these areas.

We can't do everything that we all want to do, but we can certainly provide the leadership and provide some direction and provide a great deal of programmatic support and certainly research support to help lead the way for local government and State government to buy into what is happening here and to get involved in solving some of the problems.

I want to just address this bill. I will take another license if I might, Mr. Chairman, without taking all my time to make a speech. This bill, unlike the President's bill, just doesn't talk about goals. It talks about some steps calculated to reach the goals, and that is a very important distinction.

One of them that we find in urban areas that is a most severe problem, I think, is the environment that our children have to try to learn in. The deteriorated buildings, the poor safety conditions, the drugs and violence. And I want you to talk, if you would, Dr. Prophet or Dr. Garcia, about the importance of having these issues addressed, and the importance of having the Federal Government get into addressing them now.

Because, overall it seems to me the issue is how can we offer each child the same opportunity in the setting in which they must be educated. And the Federal Government has been involved in equity in education for all these years, and this now emerges as a very important equity issue, in my judgement. I want to know how you felt about it, and if you agree with me on that.

Mr. PROPHET. I certainly do, Congressman Jefferson. I think one way of kind of retrospectively looking at how the whole physical facilities and overall environment has developed is to look back on the reality when American population was undergoing reasonably rapid expansion during the first 20 or 30 years of the 20th century, where many, many buildings were being built at the time. It was one of the multiple waves of immigrants who were coming.

Then after World War II, when you had increased urbanization, but at the same time suburbanization, if persons were to move outside of the basic concentric urban circle of a standard metropolitan statistical area, you then began to get into the 1950's and the 1960's the development of newer buildings in suburbia.

So taking just from the grassroots it is, I think, looking that one can graphically conceptualize the evolution of the situation, whereas in urban American, particularly in the East Coast, the New Yorks, the Philadelphias, and even in the mid-West, the Detroits, and Chicagos, where a lot of those constructions are really occurring, you go look at those buildings, 1910, 1915, 1920, 1925, so those buildings are 75 years old.

In suburbia, though, they are not without their problems, you have what is relatively a newer physical infrastructure that is there. Then, without raising the ire of Mr. Goodling, because I want to be very cautious here, we did in fact run into serious physical difficulties in the 1970's and in the 1980's, and in the 1960's for that matter.

And when school districts were called upon with the advent of higher educational expectations and things of that kind, to balance their budgets, to give contracts to newly emerging professional organizations in the form of unions, to do more for youngsters to have equal educational opportunity, and at the same time during the 1970's when we got into an economic inflation, the reverse of where we are now, to where you had 14, 15, 16 percent inflationary pressures upon us in the late 1970's, the only place that we could go to get money to provide educational services was from the physical facilities budget.

So all of us throughout America robbed the physical facilities budget. And since 1974, 1975, 1976, I would say until the current time, I would venture to say in 95 percent of the urban school systems of America very few of them have been able to do anything close to building a kind of physical infrastructure that would provide a foundation for the restoration and renovation of a physical facilities plant.

You can go in buildings where roofs are decayed, there are buildings in this country where they are classified by, this is a 10 bucket building, or a 20 bucket building. You go into those that the windows are decayed there.

We still have one problem though, there are certain Federal requisites—and I can speak for Portland, we have done a remarkable job there but that is because we have been fortunate with our taxpayers—the asbestos requirements, something that we didn't even know about when these buildings were being built. that is still there.

As you speak of security, that is an ever growing problem in urban America. We would like to have what we would consider to be drug-free zones, or zones in which certain activities could not occur. But our schools and our communities are still threatened because on the one hand we want to be open to society, we want all people to come in. By the same token, we have to by default give access to our students, and to our kids of people—excuse my expression—off the streets without, in many instances, having the kind of security that we want.

The other thing is just a psychological condition. If you have surroundings for young people that are not conducive to learning, and they are not healthful, they are not bright and celebrious, and this is just not the kinds of conditions we want at all.

But for the most part, and in summary, we have been forced, by virtue of the mere physical realities of the evolution of the physical infrastructure of American schools, to have urban schools to be in a higher state of disrepair than in other areas.

One last example, New York City it is estimated would require $5 billion to $6 billion—they have a million kids there, to bring their school system up to what one would consider to be moderately acceptable.

Portland, which is a school system with one-twentiety the size, for example, of New York, I have spent and my board has spent $100 million in the last 10 years. We brought our school system where we think it is reasonably okay. But we could spend another $100 million, because we have a $1 billion physical plant that the taxpayers have paid for, and if it is permitted to deteriorate, the replacement costs become inordinately more costly than the initial costs that were incurred when these structures were first built. So it is a tremendous need.

I would like to make one last point. The $1.5 billion figure, which may be a question that was derived, was not a figure out of the top of our heads. We surveyed the physical facilities, questions were asked. It is really estimated that something closer to $5 billion annually over the course of the next 9 years would be needed. And we have generally only gone, you know, less than one-third or so, in terms of asking what we need as help.

And it is tough to pass bonds, you know, for physical buildings. Most of the bonds that are passed are passed not necessarily for the construction of new buildings; they are generally for expanding enrollments and things of this kind. Thank you.

Mr. GARCIA. Everything that Dr. Prophet has said is true. I would only add a couple of things, and one is that the reasons the bonds issues have failed in many of our large cities is that the inner-city has become predominantly minority, and low-based, low tax base.

And the majority community has refused to support, over a period of 20 or 30 years, construction of new facilities or renovations or new facilities. And they work to achieve the goals that we want to achieve by the year 2000.

The expectations and the climate for that instructional program in our inner-city schools has to reflect a belief in the future. And for many of these kids and for many of the teachers teaching in those schools, they have lost that sense of the future. And facilities are extremely important to create that climate.

In Kansas City we were successful through a court desegregation case to renovate and redo our whole physical infrastructure, at a cost of $1 billion. In Tucson, we were successful in passing a bond issue of half a billion dollars for the next 7 years.

It is extremely critical that we are able to stay ahead of our building needs and our maintenance of our facilities if we are going to create the climate for kids to learn in those schools and for teachers to teach effectively in those schools.

Chairman KILDEE. As an aside here, I have been in school buildings in America that a Federal judge would not allow us to keep prisoners in. That's a fact. Matter of fact, we have built a new jail in Genesee County, Michigan at the order of the Federal Court, but I have yet to see a Federal Court ordering us to build a new school. And we had no choice over that. The taxes had to be used, and the bonds issued.

But I have been in schools that it is a fact that a Federal Judge would look at and say, "You can't keep people here in this building." And some Federal judges have been very assiduous at ordering jail construction, but they have not yet got involved in ordering school construction. Just an aside for some thought.

Ms. ADAMS-RODGERS. Might I speak to the issue of facilities in rural areas?

Chairman KILDEE. Certainly. The red light is still on, and the witnesses are still talking.

Ms. ADAMS-RODGERS. We, in Kentucky, in fact just recently there was an article in one of our larger newspapers regarding a school in far eastern Kentucky that has a cafeteria located actually adjacent to the school building, on stilts.

We have a problem in eastern Kentucky with subsurface rights, and so schools when they are purchasing property in order to build facilities must very carefully make sure that nothing is done below the surface that will affect the structure and the resources on top of the surface. And so those issues, again it is a magnitude issue as well.

In Kentucky we have seen—in fact, I was in a school system that was growing at the rate of 16 percent a year, one of the few counties in Kentucky that was growing. And the cost for school constructions are phenomenal, they are out of sight, and it is very difficult to commit the type of budgetary—or make the type of budgetary commitment to the instructional program as well as to the capita construction program that is necessary.

So I am very sympathetic to that need, but I do want to point out that it is truly a need that exists in both places. One of magnitude, but certainly exists.

Chairman KILDEE. Mr. Petri.

Mr. PETRI. Thank you. I apologize for being a little late. Just looking at the framework of these two acts, I am filled with apprehension that schools in my district might fall between them. I have no urban center of 200,000 or more, and yet my rural areas all have joint school districts, and I think many have more than 2,500 students in their systems.

One of my most rural counties, Calumet County, has one ward that is in the City of Appleton, so the little rural hospital there qualifies for urban reimbursement. So that may be considered a major metropolitan area.

I'm just curious if you are at all willing, as we work on the Rural Schools of America Act and these other acts, to fine tune some of the definitions if there are people who fall between the cracks and who are in truly rural areas.

The largest town in my district is 15,000, and we rapidly go down from there. I have many counties which don't even have an electric stop and go light, or didn't until recently. I am very familiar with

the little white schoolhouse, having grown up in the country. We still have them. They have mainly been turned into town halls and voting places and little museums.

And it is really a wonderful thing that people do keep that alive, and keep it as a kind of a symbol of town government and rural democracy. Because this schoolhouse embodied one of the commitments we made as a community to have an educated population so we could have a working democracy.

But anyway, my only question is what about those of us who may fall through this particular safety net?

Mr. LESTINA. In the rural bill that Mr. Perkins and others have drafted, it is not just the 2,500 student population. There is an or in there, and that is—and I wanted to check this back with you, Congressman Petri, is that there is a 15 percent below the poverty line, and we crafted that hoping that that would catch. It's not—you don't have to meet both. It is one or the other in order to qualify.

And I would think that in that case, many of what we are talking about there, being that it is a 15 percent figure on the rural side, would meet your concern. The other part that I would like to emphasize is that, of course, I am always willing, open and wanting to cooperate with you on anything that goes forward.

Chairman KILDEE. Perhaps we can have a Perkins-Petri-Jefferson Act here, all together here.

All right, Mrs. Mink? Mr. Reed?

Mr. REED. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to commend you for holding this hearing, and to particularly thank Chairman Perkins and Mr. Jefferson for their efforts on advancing this legislation, and the panel for their insightful and very thought provoking remarks.

This is an important, probably the most important topic I think we face in the Nation, for the reasons that you all elicited so well. And it goes to the point I think Dr. Prophet alluded to, and that—maybe this is a question really of whether we will have hope for the next generation of Americans, not just once in school but all of them.

And I think, as a result, this issue requires us to ask probing and hard questions. Essentially you have come before us and asked the Federal Government to make a massive contribution of dollars to education, when traditionally, historically, and constitutionally, this has been primarily a State and local role.

One, I think the primary fundamental question that I should address to you all is, given the structural status of education in America today, given some of the inherent problems which are within your prerogative to address, would you invest $21 million in the Portland system today? Or $15 million in the New York system?

I am hearing stories about school systems in which the teachers with the least preparation, the youngest teachers, probably not the best teachers, all find themselves in the poorest schools, while the mature, experienced, better teachers are in the well-to-do schools in the same system. And that is a structural problem you can deal with.

There are a host of others. The bottom line question is if we are going to give you millions and millions of dollars, what should the

localities do to cure themselves? And I pose that question, and do it to help us move forward.

Mr. PROPHET. I will begin, if you want. I don't think that we should ask for, nor should you consider seriously giving to us a blank check. I would be foolhardy in the time of economic stress, a time when America is probably undergoing the most serious economic recession since the Great Depression, to say that you should be spendthrifts in Congress.

I know the pressures, at least I think I have some empathy for the pressures that you are under. So we must be accountable. We must be accountable, and we must be able, as a Deputy Superintendent from Kentucky said, to have certain measurable accountable results accrue after we get into this.

By the same token, getting to the structural problem. We have in America, again if you want to reflect historically, a structural organizational dilemma when it comes to an indefensible number of school districts in America.

There are 15,000. So looking first structurally, first of all there are too many school districts. You have got 15,000 school districts here.

I am of the opinion that that number could be dramatically reduced, and through such reduction, there could be a commensurate realization of certain currently expended administrative costs that could go as a part of an investment that we need to make through local school districts.

The problem there, of course, is that the Federal Government, by virtue of its statutory constitutional, legalistic, legal—I'm sorry, legal status really has no authority to do whatever about how many districts there are, unless you want to tie strings to that. You could, in fact, have as an incentive for States and/or other local regions qualifying for the funds, some kind of initiative on their part to consolidate, because there are certain savings there.

I think also that we need to commit ourselves to what everyone now accepts in America as the way to engender the greatest amount of productivity in America, and that is through some kind of site-based school improvement; that we need to move away from the long-standing vertical hierarchial structures of seven to eight layers of bureaucracies and school systems, and in States that many people cannot defend their existence. And I think we need to broaden that, and we need to make it more of a horizontal kind of structure.

So I think that we should be responsible to you, to show that we are in fact going to involve communities. One of the components of this bill—I don't know exactly what page it is on, and Michael Casserly, who knows more about the entrails of the bill than I, can tell you where it is—but we do have a very broad base involvement of people, whether it is the city, the county, the citizens, nonprofit groups, private groups, universities, students and everyone else who is involved in that.

So the answer is, sir, we should be called to task to answer that question for you before you give us a dime. There should be certain strings I think that you should attach to it, and that prior to our qualifying for it, we should be able to give you evidence that we are serious, and will come forward with some levels of accountability.

Mr. REED. Let me just follow up, because again I am extremely sympathetic to your request and I do believe we have to make this a priority issue in our country, and not just rhetorically but with resources and programs.

What I see, what I fear happening is that we will produce sort of another layer through stake holders, committees, through whatever we call these commissions, circumventing States and trying to get down into the classroom but without affecting the behavior of States and of present structures.

That is why I think we need your guidance . We don't want another layer or an ancillary sort of a back door approach to get some extra money down into the schools, but not essentially prompting, or being the catalyst for, fundamental reform.

And if I was a teacher I would probably want to move up to a nice, pleasant school, close to the suburbs in the central city, with a good group of dedicated young students and parents that are concerned.

That seems to be happening. And that is a challenge I think that you have to face every day. And rather than assuming that we will come in with the magic bullet to cure everyone, I think you have to work that way right now for reform in your own way.

Yes, ma'am?

Ms. ADAMS-RODGERS. If I may address again something that happened in Kentucky. And it is such a pleasure to be able to be talking about some of the real positive efforts in Kentucky, because that has not always been the case.

One of the things that occurred in the Supreme Court decision which was an appeal of the court case on the actual equity issue, filed by property poor school districts, was to look at the entire system of education. It was all deemed unconstitutional. So the apple cart was indeed turned over.

And as a local superintendent at that time, I wasn't so sure that was a good idea, because there were good pieces as well. But what it did was get everyone's attention. And the attention given to it has been that you are not doing the same thing a new way with more money, you are indeed doing something differently.

And that the basic fundamental principle is that all children can learn and will be successful. And the stretch is that we will not be just competitive within Kentucky or within the United States, but it will be an international competitiveness.

Now those words have not been spoken in Kentucky in a long time. And it has truly gotten everyone's attention that it is much easier to talk about than it is to implement, which is why the legislation has about a 6 year time line in it.

And that is also why there are various pieces that are just fundamental to the change in the decision making process, which brings in the ownership at the local level, which creates the opportunity to say to a school superintendent and a school council, "These are the things at the school level that are different for our students." And these are the kind of people we need to implement it.

Mr. REED. If I may follow up. Have you seen, or do you anticipate changes in terms of realignment of districts, consolidation of districts, changes in the local school committees, for example?

Ms. ADAMS-RODGERS. Yes.

Mr. REED. Do your local cities and towns have school committees which are still the primary source of educational policy?

Ms. ADAMS-RODGERS. There are school boards that operate in all of our school districts. We have 176 districts. There are 120 counties and 56 independent districts. I think by the very nature of the funding mechanism that is now in place that we will see the need for either a tremendous increase in local effort in those independent districts in particular, or a consolidation with the county districts.

The school boards have—the role and responsibility of the school boards has changed significantly with this piece of legislation. And the school-based councils have a whole set of responsibilities in terms of policy and accountability. And I think Dr. Prophet, what he has said is absolutely essential, there is no reason for us to believe, expect, nor any logic in saying, "Send us more money," without making sure that there is the accountability piece.

Mr. REED. Just a final point. I will make the point that my sense, having spent several years in the State Senate in Rhode Island and a few months here under the tutelage of our Chairman, I have observed that things usually happen when the people with the money decide that they want things to happen. When it comes to education, it is the States and localities statistically, historically that have that money.

I think we are all willing to participate in fundamental reform. I just hope we are not the only participants. So that I would urge you to, as you have done in Kentucky, apparently, and we are doing other places, to likewise enlist the aid of the States, and I think together, States, and cities, and towns, and the Federal Government we can make progress. One sector trying to go forward will, I think, invariably not make real progress.

I thank you for your testimony. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KILDEE. Mr. Pastor.

Mr. PASTOR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, let me apologize for being a little late. I made the quorum for a meeting. So thank you for coming this morning, and I want to welcome my distinguished superintendent from Tucson.

Later on this afternoon, I will be voting on how to bail out the banking system. And we are talking about a possibility of $70 billion. And it is interesting that today, this morning, we are talking of how to invest in the future of America by investing in our children. And we are talking about $3 billion, that I believe we need to begin investing back into our public school system to ensure that our system is viable and is producing a product that can compete with other countries.

I know that education is a local and State responsibility, and I recognize that. But I also recognize where there are special needs, like in the urban schools and the rural schools, that it is a Federal responsibility to provide resources and to get involved.

We have now national goals, adopted by the President and by various public advocacy groups for education. As Congressman Jefferson said, this bill provides some methods to achieve those goals.

And so I think my responsibility is to provide the resources to the local level, which will develop and implement comprehensive,

holistic approaches to ensure that our children are educated in a safe, caring environment.

So I will be working very hard to help the supporters of this bill to make sure it becomes a reality. If you have any comments to add, fine. I have no further questions, but I welcome you to. And thank you for coming.

Mr. LESTINA. I do have a comment, Congressman Pastor. We talk about the banking system and the Savings and Loan crisis that we have in this country. An analogy can be made for education right along side of that, in fact, even more so. To postscript what you have said, that we cannot afford not to federally invest in education in America, and in directions that we can move to do that, and kind of requirements for Federal dollars, I would ask us to very carefully consider providing the dollars to the school district level, moving toward the goals, and utilizing the stake holder panels at the local level to devise and move in that direction. But that, what could be interpreted from Congressman Reed there is that we be looking at a forced consolidation of some type.

Consolidation, I think, will happen in the rural areas, and it is voluntarily coming together in forming new school districts, and let that happen that way. Otherwise, we are looking at something forced that makes for hard feelings. And it is happening now a lot along the lines of local athletic conferences coming together, and what used to be separate schools are no longer that way.

But if we use that kind of approach, I think we will have the local, the State, and the national kind of cooperation and get on with the investment that we just have to make in education. Thank you, sir.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you. Let me ask a question on rural education. I think my first two questions were urban. What role can technology play in solving the unique educational concerns of rural America? And what roles can the colleges and universities—each State has a system of colleges and universities—play in helping address those problems?

Mr. LESTINA. Mr. Chairman, in my judgement the two go together very well. If indeed we are going to provide to the rural students of America exposure to the higher maths, foreign language, critical thinking skills, and those kinds of things, it will take distance learning, two-way technologies, utilizing the school buildings where they presently exist, by operating with a teacher that may be several miles away in another school.

So all of those students can see each other in the individual schools and the teacher, and can ask questions and follow-up questions as though they were in the same classroom. That's what technology brings to us today.

Now with the colleges and universities in that same kind of system, we can very nicely provide college course work and so forth to the rural areas through that kind of technology, without the transportation and the actual physical movement of students and/or teachers.

This kind of thing we were trying to get around for several years through the consolidation method, but with technology and the distance learning. This is a tremendous boon toward getting at the rural brain pool that can go undeveloped without exposure to the

kinds of things that both colleges and universities, and distance learning between existing school systems taking place. Thank you.

Ms. ADAMS-RODGERS. If I may address the technology piece first. We have an expectation by the middle of December that we will have a design in place for the networking of all 1,366 of our schools back through the school districts to the Department of Education, and really to each other.

It is a networking piece of the whole technology implementation plan, in that we have also been in dialogue with council on higher education and, therefore, the community college system as well to network those agencies into that same system.

It is imperative that the higher education folks realize that elementary and secondary education, and the success of our total Reform Act impacts upon them. And, in fact, there is a shared responsibility for activity through action by the legislature and a joint resolution that required a plan at the higher education level for their involvement in the implementation of the Reform Act.

So those two things have actually come together by design. And as we come into this technology system, we believe that they will be very critical players in that.

In the eastern part of Kentucky in particular the distance learning issue has been tremendous. We have students who are able to take probability and statistics, physics classes in a small rural high school who would not have that opportunity. Therefore, their ability to go into a college or university for advanced study is available to them.

It is an interactive system through the Star Channel in our Kentucky education television network. So for rural Kentucky, it has a tremendous impact, and for far eastern Kentucky in particular.

Chairman KILDEE. Doctor Prophet?

Mr. PROPHET. I know there was a question for the rural contingent and their responses were outstanding. I agree one thousand percent with what they said. There is a point I want to make here, that perhaps this committee, if not in this setting, in some other setting, I would hope in the future, could support.

As I mentioned earlier, I am a retired military officer, and by virtue of having believed for many, many years that the pedagogical approach as in the military when it comes to preparing people to do things well, I think that there is nothing on this globe, no one on this globe that does it as well as the military forces of the United States.

And I would also—I will make that statement after having been in public education for 20 years. So, there was published—I don't know the name of the directorate or the edict itself, but out of the Department of Defense several months ago, a year or so ago, did come some kind of a directive that deals with the down sizing of the military. And, by virtue of such down sizing, the apparent creation of making available to the private sector software and hardware that is no longer of need by virtue of the down sizing that is occurring.

We are working in Portland with a Colonel Jimmy Jones, who is the Senior Army Advisor for the State of Oregon, and more closely with Deputy Commanding General Brady at Sixth Army in California, and he is in contact with the Department of Defense. And we

believe that we could be on the verge of doing these many, many wonderful things that are being described here, at little if any cost.

In other words, we recognize that much of the technology of an advanced type that is being used in the military is for the most part particularized to military applications. But there are some parts of it, and many parts of which, which if they are "degreened," taking the demilitarized—the military parts out of it, can be in fact applied in the private sector.

We are submitting grants to not only—well we are submitting grants only to the private sector, companies that are connected with the business round table, asking them to fund that.

But we are working as a model system, as designated by General Brady and the Department of Defense, and I think we are going to get the approval of Chief of Staff, Colin Powell, for this.

But I only wanted to offer that to you, that this is something. Since I have got this chance to say it, I will never have the chance again, please help us with that if you ever hear about it, because we do have, I'm sure in Kentucky and other places, model schools of a kind that are operative if we could have some assistance.

You know technology is very costly, and what the Congressman was mentioning earlier there about the disproportionality of certain teachers being in certain schools and in certain cities in America, I'm sure that is true to some extent. I won't deny that.

It is much less true now than it was before. But you also have a symbol of kinds of disproportionality when it comes to the condition of buildings, when it comes to equipment, when it comes to computers, when it comes to technology, when it comes to many other things. So there are things that we can do to utilize the surplus, so to speak, of the military to a great advantage of American education.

Chairman KILDEE. Your point is very good. I really think that is an opportunity for us. I can recall at the end of World War II much of the equipment was, you know, transferred to the civilian sector, and some of the technology at that time. I mentioned also in conjunction with that that the military has been much more successful in acquiring that technology.

I mentioned last week, and I have said this many times, that they never had to have a bake sale to get their computers, never had to use the cash register receipts from Safeway or Giant. They were well funded in that. And I know many schools had to use a bake sale, maybe some of your own use that.

But I do think your point is very good, that there will be equipment that can be used and people who know how to use it. I have been impressed with the training programs in the military, using computers to provide hands on training in certain areas without really being hands on. But I appreciate your point.

Mr. PROPHET. Yes, sir.

Chairman KILDEE. Mr. Perkins, do you have any additional questions?

Mr. PERKINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't want to belabor some of these points, but in listening to the testimony that I have been given today, it strikes me that I have heard an emphasis placed by the panel upon things like technology being in buildings, being a capital construction, being areas that perhaps they need

some sort of assistance that they don't have the present funding to do adequately themselves. Am I correct in that statement?

Are there other additional areas? I'm still searching. You know we have to, as we have talked about, look at the Federal, State, and local areas of education, and what we bring to those. And I'm struggling.

If we are looking at a Federal area, we are looking at doing something in a big way on a Federal basis. I'm looking and seeing, wanting to know areas that you think appropriate that we can perhaps assist those in partnership with States and localities. What can we as a Federal Government do with additional funds, to target those funds in the most effective manner possible?

Ms. ADAMS-RODGERS. I think again the building blocks for a successful child begin, as does dropout prevention, on the early intervention. And as we have talked before, Kentucky's approach with the at-risk student coming into the school program is going to make a difference.

But those 4 year old programs, and in fact for preschool handicapped children, the three and 4 year old programs will make a significant difference in what happens for those children. There is not enough money to serve all the children.

In fact, in Kentucky, as excited as I know you all are now about Kentucky's Education Reform Program, we do have a $150 million shortfall in our general fund budget, and the commitment of the legislature is not to touch the reform piece if at all possible.

So there is a very strong State commitment to that. But I think the more resources that can be put into the early intervention programs the better our children will be in the future. Our ability to be patient with that, of course, is necessary because that change will occur over a period of time.

It is essential that we look at that as our dropout prevention program, as our early intervention program, as our building block for a change, a break in the system that says to a child, the parent that says to a child, "Education is not important."

In addition to that, or in parallel, I guess in partners with that, is this intervention with the family. Again, the typical family of two parents and two children no longer exists except for 6 percent of the population. And I think we have to recognize that. Those statistics happen in rural as well as urban areas, as well as suburban areas.

And in order to really create a change in how school is viewed, how education is viewed by parents and children and the success for children, we need to address that family issue. And that brings all these agencies together and working for children. Some of the assistance can come through some deregulation on how funds are already able to be used.

I have worked in school settings where Chapter I monies and materials have been excellent. And those materials have not been able to be used for anyone but those children who were eligible for that.

Now I understand the folks also would say to you that Chapter I money, the ability to get Chapter I money again in a subsequent year, was really dependent upon the fact that you still had kids who had made progress.

For some reason that seems a little bit skewed to me. It ought to be more of an incentive program that says, "As you have made progress, let us help you make some more. Let us help you stretch some more."

So some of those issues that could be addressed at the Federal level don't require necessarily the additional money, but a reassessment of how the resources that are already going into our schools can best be used to address the needs of children.

So I see that focus on early intervention, the family support services, be it through the PACE Program, which I think you are familiar with, the Parent and Child in Education Program, which provides a GED component for the parent who does not have that educational background themselves. Additional programs in that area, as well as this issue of using the resources to address the needs of all children.

Mr. LESTINA. Congressman Perkins, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KILDEE. Yes, go ahead.

Mr. LESTINA. If we are really going to make the kind of investment that should be made, we—I would ask us to trust the local education agency to be able to provide them the dollars within the guidelines determined by the stake holders in education, the teachers, the parents, the students. To be able to move toward the goals under parameters that could be set in a format that would be in the neighborhood of general aid to local school districts.

Moving outside of the parameters of what we have talked about here, something in the neighborhood of $100 billion a year, that is what it would take to really do the job and do it right. And what would be done would be different from school district to school district, to fit those individual local needs within parameters, general parameters set in a good big bill.

Keeping the categoricals and the targets that presently exist, which are primarily for equity and access for targeted populations, allowing the local school districts to add to that if they wish, or adjust in other areas.

Now when you frame the question, that is what feels like to us ought to be beyond the—on the horizon as to not what can be so much as what should be, and then when we know what should be then it becomes more of a can be. Because, if we don't authorize that kind of thing, we will never get it appropriated. Thank you.

Chairman KILDEE. Dr. Garcia.

Mr. GARCIA. I would just add that we believe the bill that Congressman Jefferson is sponsoring, and this committee is considering, will go a long ways to addressing all of the issues that have been brought today. We believe it is a comprehensive approach at resolving these problems.

It works towards establishing those goals and then targeting funds, allowing local agencies to work with the State departments and other collaboratives within their community to address those issues, and bring about resolution. And it also provides for accountability.

And we believe, as we have stated in our testimony, that if we are to achieve the goals that we all want to achieve in this country we are going to need to do something comprehensively. And it is going to require additional dollars.

Mr. PROPHET. I will be very brief. I agree with the comments made before me. It is very difficult to add to what has been said, except that if you were to ask me to make one request to you which, in my judgment, would make the greatest positive impact upon the quality of education in America and the quality of life in America, it would be for you to examine two things very closely and to act upon them any way that you could.

Number one, please look at the social support for the citizens of America. It is deadly. It is just deadly. The last 2 weeks or so, I have been brought almost to tears when I look at what young women and students have to go through to get to school.

They have to—some of these kids have to make tremendous sacrifices just to come to school. And some of them have to get out of school to support their families. And then you make them come back to school, and they lose the support. And it is almost demeaning, it is dehumanizing.

Just examine in everything you do what the social support service net is for the American citizen, particularly those who have not yet gained their education.

The second thing is that while I know that you are not the agency which necessarily is the source of the genesis for the promulgation of all of the rules and the guidelines and the regulations that govern us, we think that the Executive Branch of our government is just overwhelming when it comes to just the proliferation of all kinds of things we are called upon to do.

Reams and reams and reams of paper and paper and paper, over and over again, and people complain, "Why so much administration?" Well, we have got to stay out of jail, and we have got to do all these things that people ask us to.

If there is anything you can do to ask the hard questions of the Executive Branch when they are bringing forth to you programs that are going to impact people and education, if they can deregulate that to a point to where, as the gentleman was saying from NEA, where we could have more local input we can be accountable.

Don't worry, the parents will hold us accountable, the students will hold us accountable. Try to do something toward effectuating some greater measure of deregulation and take the burden off our backs, and we will have more time to dedicate to education.

So those are just two additional observations: the humanization of the social support service in our country, and the deregulation that is placed on us.

Chairman KILDEE. I understand that Mr. Garcia has to catch a plane, so if he needs to leave now, we will excuse you. And I deeply appreciate your testimony here today.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you very much for inviting me and allowing me to speak here. Thank you.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you very much.

Mr. Jefferson, do you have any additional questions?

Mr. JEFFERSON. I had one, Mr. Chairman, and I am reluctant to ask it, to extend this beyond a time when I think it may be getting uncomfortable. But I want to ask this one question about research, because there has been some discussion about the lack of need for that.

And it is a feature of the bill, as you know, that costs a fair amount of money. So could you tell us what schools need, rural and urban schools, with respect to research on the problems of these schools, and how to help the children, and better ways to educate them? Is there a need for that, that is a crying need out there to get more data, and to get directed towards some better answers as to what to do about urban and rural children to better educate them?

Mr. PROPHET. Yes, sir. On the area of research, those of us who were around in the 1970's and all, when there existed at that time the National Institute of Education, we are very thankful for the high quality research that was done. We are also thankful that the time for what then existed as a very comprehensive system which permitted the effectuation of things that were proven through various demonstration grants, so that this information and knowledge gained through piloting and experimentation could be spread across America to schools.

Then suddenly the National Institute of Education was disbanded. Now while that was disbanded, and while at the same time there has been a concurrent or concomitant relative strengthening of the research laboratory systems in America, I don't think that the connection of the research labs themselves with public institutions in the sense of causing what—of causing something that you learn that works to occur quickly, that that is not happening.

In other words, we know and find out how to do things well. Some of the things that they are going to learn in Kentucky, that is going to work very, very well, I venture to say that what they learn there and what they may learn in Chicago or elsewhere will take years for it to be, from a statistical point of view and from a study of validity and statistical significance, to be validated to a point to where we can say we need to get this throughout all of America.

So there is a need, number one, for a strong research evaluation effort to cause an acceleration of things learned to be brought to the attention of others. By the same token, there is a need to find out what is working.

We have in our own school system, for example, created—you have mentioned about the universities before—we have created an alliance between ourselves and various other universities in the Portland area, and we have formed what is called a Center for Urban Research and Education, because we don't think that exists.

We think that a lot of things that may apply to certain socioeconomic groups, certain cultural groups, don't necessarily apply to black kids, for example. We think that many black kids learn different than some Asian kids. We think Asian kids, some of them, learn different, you know. And it is not to be overly generic, and I'm not trying to make anything that is inflammatory, but it is true. Different people from different cultural settings learn in different ways.

We also know that you can have two youngsters, let's say two young black boys—because I happen to have three young black boys who are my sons, okay—in the same family, same mother, same father, and two of them succeed. Same church, same uncle, same aunts, same church, same school, same teacher. Two succeed

and one fails. Why? We focus on the failure syndrome. What is it that causes kids to succeed?

So we believe, in answer to Congressman Jefferson's question, that there are many very good questions out there that we need to know answers to, some of which we already know answers to. But those answers need to be spread more quickly. And there are other things and questions to which we don't have answers, that we need to learn, and some of them are particularly unique to the sub-population within America.

America is not a conglomerate of a melting pot to where there is just one profile. We are a very diverse group of people, and I think there are a lot that each of us needs to know about each other.

Last point, I have tried. I have been a superintendent now for 15 years, 15 years both in Lansing and in Portland, Oregon, and I know that as a superintendent, in terms of lending my efforts toward attempting to contribute to the success of kids, that I have succeeded in terms of raising the achievement of white kids, Asian kids, Hispanic kids, and black kids, but I have failed miserably, absolutely miserably in the education of the American Indian.

I don't know what the answers are, and no one else in America knows what the answers are, and someone needs to find out. Even the American Indians themselves don't know what the answers are, and someone needs to look at that.

So we should, we do have a need for research for those reasons, and I strongly think that that is a very vital component. It is, admittedly, somewhat of a relative cost, it is a $100 million, as I understand it, but it is across the area. And we can do much, much more in the whole areas of research and evaluation.

Ms. ADAMS-RODGERS. I think it flows into the accountability issue as well, because we can get both the quantitative information through the research but we also need the qualitative, answering the "So what?" question. "So we put this additional money in, so what was different for students? What was the effect upon these students' learning?" Which is really what our ultimate measure is going to be about. What is the outcome when that student leaves school?

One of the things that we have been particularly concerned about in Kentucky is that very issue. And, in fact, in trying to construct an evaluation design that looks at not only the numbers of students who are served by programs who weren't served in those programs prior to the Reform Act, what difference did it make for those children. What difference did it make for those schools and those staff members?

I think the linkage between the educational laboratories and the universities has indeed not occurred. It is they both have kind of operated in their separate realms, and we have not created the opportunity for the practitioners to be privy to that information in a very timely fashion. So we are not reinventing the wheel.

A whole separate area in terms of the effective schools research that has been done over the past several years is not in implementation in many of the schools. And, in fact, we are trying to add an additional group of schools this year, using those effective schools correlates, and disaggregating data so we can look at the very issues you are talking about.

What is different for, or is there information from the disaggregation of the test data that shows us there is a difference in what we need to be doing for some students over others? So the answer to the question is yes, I think research is an extremely important piece of the pie, and a very important part of the accountability issue.

Mr. LESTINA. Just a couple of postscripts. It is so important to get the research into the classrooms where the teacher and the student meet one another. One of the impediments seems to be now is the research being done, and the lack of dollars for disseminating that information into the classroom. The other part that goes along with that is the time to read it and the time to be able to use it and the ability to use it.

Now you can only put just so much water in a glass, and it runs over. And when the teacher has got all other kinds of responsibilities, it is tough to be able to read it and use it. We don't have the adjustment of time to be able to do that, and that all takes dollars.

Now in a specific area, we are going to move into the technological area, and we are looking at the distance learning, research as to which kind of system is best for what purposes, and what is compatible and what is not is a—there is a crying need, because you have got all different kinds of systems and salesmen for each, and for folks who really aren't up to speed as to what research would show as what the best advantages are of each, the purchasers are more in the dark than they should be. Thank you.

Chairman KILDEE. Mr. Pastor?

Mr. PASTOR. No further questions. I believe in saving time.

Chairman KILDEE. Very good. This has been an excellent panel. I deeply appreciate your role, coming here today. This committee intends to move a major education bill. And the two hearings we have had so far have been very helpful in developing that.

We put out a bill, H.R. 3320, which will assist and encourage states to implement systemic reforms in education, and we are all watching Kentucky because you have the opportunity really to do it. Sometimes what is imposed as a heavy responsibility, and for some a burden, can be really an opportunity. And I think the way that Kentucky has responded to that has been as an opportunity.

I really want to come down to Kentucky. I have been down there with Chris' father a number of times. I want to come down there, Chris has invited me down there, to really look at some of the things you are doing there.

We do intend to put, as I say, a bill together to do that. H.R. 3320 is just a start. I assured all the members of this committee when we reported it out that this was not the major bill, but I think that you have given us some ideas for a major bill.

You pointed out to us some of the unique problems that urban schools have, some of the unique problems that rural schools have, and some of the shared problems that the schools have. And I think this will be very helpful to us as we address a major bill.

I want to thank all of you. We will keep the record open for 2 additional weeks for any additional testimony. I know Mike Casserly will be approaching me with additional testimony, and probably reminding me that the USA Bill begins with, as he says to me, you. And I will try to bear that responsibility. Thank you very much, and we will stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:40 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned, pursuant to the call of the Chair.]

○

ISBN 0-16-037514-2